

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1897.

The Week.

It is now conceded by all that the Senate will not accept the recommendations of the finance committee for increased taxes on beer and tobacco and a duty on tea, to obtain the \$32,000,000 of additional revenue which Mr. Aldrich has declared necessary in order to secure a surplus of less than \$3,000,000. The Senate committee is now discussing the proposition for a stamp tax on bank checks, but the Washington correspondent of the *Philadelphia Press* reports that such a measure is generally considered excusable only in time of war, and that "it can be put down as certain that the House will not consent to it." It is not strange that Congressmen should shrink from imposing a tax of this sort after refusing to increase the tax on beer and tobacco. A stamp tax is a good way of raising revenue, but that fact does not commend it to our national legislators. Their theory seems to be that any tax which will raise revenue is for that reason not to be thought of, and so they go on adopting prohibitory rates of duty and condemning every proposed change which would bring money into the Treasury.

The truth is that Senator Aldrich has put the Republican party "in a hole" by his reference to revenue taxes in his speech last month. After showing the absolute necessity of securing at least \$24,000,000 more from internal-revenue taxes, as well as \$8,000,000 from a duty on tea, he demonstrated the propriety of obtaining this \$24,000,000 from heavier rates on beer and tobacco. "Assuming that the necessity for additional revenue exists," he said, "there can be no question, no economic reason, and none that affects the public interests, why beer and tobacco should not bear their share of additional taxation." Nobody has ever disputed this statement. No economic reason, no reason that affects the public interest, has been given why the beer tax should not be increased. Everybody knows that there is only one reason why this wise policy is not adopted, and that is because the Republican managers do not want to run the risk of offending the brewing interest. Such a surrender is as foolish politically as economically. Instead of insuring a Republican victory in Ohio, the *Philadelphia Ledger* warns the party that, "with the proposed abject surrender of the majority of the Senate to such influences, the result of the election in that and in some of the Western

States may reasonably be considered doubtful."

All that the Senate positively did on Friday was to increase, by a majority of only two votes, the differential in favor of refined sugar—and so, of course, in favor of the Sugar Trust. The very narrowness of the majority will, we should suppose, incite the House to make a fight for its own lower rates. But the most significant thing in the day's proceedings was Senator Allison's frank avowal that the sugar schedule was not intended to be a revenue schedule. He said openly, "I wish to disclaim any responsibility for this duty as a revenue duty." What it was meant for was to shut out foreign sugar altogether, and lead to our producing ourselves all we consume. In other words, Mr. Allison and the finance committee accept the platform of the beet-sugar growers. This means the repeal of the Hawaiian reciprocity treaty, the levying of a surtax on German and Austrian sugar, and the inauguration of a tariff war with those countries.

The action of the Senate regarding barley last week showed the utter contempt which the Republicans of that body feel for the protests of their own party against the prohibitive rates of duty which the pending bill so frequently imposes. The existing rate on barley is 30 per cent. ad valorem, which, at the present value of barley, is less than 10 cents per bushel. Under this rate importations have practically ceased, and yet the pending bill raises the duty to 30 cents per bushel, which must be absolutely prohibitive. The Republican business men and newspapers of Oswego, N. Y., rose in revolt against this proposition when they first heard of it, and the *Times* of that city a few days ago expressed the opinion that "when a candid examination of this item in the tariff bill, as now proposed, is made, there will be no hesitation in modifying the rate to conform to the principles of protective tariff legislation as expounded by Senator Aldrich himself," in his speech introducing the bill, when he said that "in the readjustment of rates suggested the committee have tried in every instance to make them sufficiently protective to domestic interests, without being prohibitive." But when this part of the bill was reached on June 1, the prohibitive rates were sustained; and the Oswego Republicans were notified that Mr. Aldrich's words were not intended to be taken seriously—as they ought to have known from the start.

We regret to have to record a great breach made in the protective theory

on Thursday by the defeat of the proposed bounty on agricultural exports. It is well known that protection is a system of pure logic. All its parts hang together in beautiful coördination and dependence, and all you have to do to get a new protective tax is to show that it is strictly logical. Sugar was made free in 1890 because the logic of protection called for it; and it will be taxed in 1897 for the same reason. Now the Lubin doctrine of really protecting farmers by paying them bounties can be shown to be a necessary and logical part of protection. Lubin has challenged the American Tariff League to meet him in joint debate on that subject, for a stake of \$1,000, but they have not dared pick up his glove. Nor were the arguments of the bounty advocates answered in the Senate on Thursday; they could not be. They were simply voted down. Logic could do nothing against brute numbers. Mr. Lubin's inference is that protection is, therefore, not what it professes to be, but a one-sided, humbugging, and fraudulent affair. It needs not a *Dogberry* to affirm that this has now been clearly proved, and that it will go hard but it will soon be believed.

With the certainty that some kind of tariff bill will get through the Senate, speculation about the conference committee—who will compose it and what they will do—is getting to be the subject of first interest at Washington. It has been a tacit protectionist maxim from of old, "Let who will make the House tariff or the Senate tariff, provided I may make the conference-committee tariff." The subtle art of compromise has never had more wonderful exhibitions than in this committee. It was in the tariff of 1883, we believe, that the House voted for a duty of 50 cents a ton on coal and the Senate for 25 cents; this divergence of views was harmonized in committee by agreeing on a duty of 75 cents. When asked how they came to split the difference in this somewhat puzzling way, one of the conferees explained that "Mahone wanted it." Mahone was not even on the committee, but he stuck his head in at the door, asked for a 75-cent duty, and got it. This illustrates the majesty as well as the mystery of a conference committee, and explains the anxiety of the wool-growers as to how they may fare there. They are said to be much alarmed just now over rumors that Senator Quay is reserving his "strategy" for the conference committee. He is going to lull them into a false security by letting them get their high duties on carpet wools through the Senate, and then, in the interest of the Philadelphia carpet-

manufacturers, have them cut in two in conference. The Pennsylvania Senator will no doubt bear watching in any question of tariff strategy; as Voltaire said of Habbakuk, he is *capable de tout*. And the worst of it is, from the wool-growers' point of view, that the conference committee, if made up according to precedent, will consist almost wholly of Eastern Representatives and Senators, who cannot be depended upon always to do the right thing by the American sheep.

The weekly imports at New York, as hitherto reported, showed that the culmination of the import movement here came in the first and second weeks of June; since then, the weekly importations had decreased 40 per cent. But Tuesday's returns for the entire United States prove that the general movement culminated even before last month. From the April aggregate of \$101,305,131, the country's total import trade dropped suddenly in May to \$79,321,827. These May returns, it is true, are still above the normal average, alike of earlier months this year and of the same month in preceding years. But there is no such startling difference as was presented by the April record, and, moreover, the returns of New York's weekly importations, falling from \$18,382,000 in the opening week of May to \$10,906,907 last week, prove that the total June returns will be still smaller. Meantime, it will be noticed that the country's export figures for the month of May show a further increase. They exceed the May exports of 1896 by upwards of \$11,000,000, and they have never been approached in any spring month of our history. The balance of international trade in merchandise, which in April turned to \$23,579,431 excess of imports over exports, in May presented an import excess of only \$1,559,343. The export balance for the eleven completed months of the fiscal year still reaches \$298,180,659, which was not approached, within forty or fifty millions, even in years of such enormous outward trade as 1879 and 1892.

In no State have the Populists made such a failure of administration as in Kansas. They secured practically complete control of the government, and they did practically nothing. While this was very satisfactory to the conservative part of the community, it was of course discouraging to sincere Populists. They might well be disappointed that they could pass none of the tremendous measures demanded by their principles; they could better endure that the measures should fail of their effect when enacted than fail to be enacted at all. But in one respect they were not disappointed. They secured a Superintendent of Insurance who showed a genuine

and implacable hostility to all the corporations that he could get at. Among other feats he banned the companies that insured against damage from tornadoes and wind-storms. Possibly he possesses the enthusiastic patriotism of Burke, who replied to a casual questioner concerning the waste and desolate regions of Ireland: "You are a liar and a scoundrel. There are no such regions in Ireland." But if the Kansas Superintendent of Insurance thought that the State was exempt from wind-storms, he was mistaken, for two days after he drove the insurance companies out, destructive gales swept over the western part of Kansas, destroying thousands of acres of wheat which the farmers had been prevented from insuring.

The worst feature of State universities is their dependence upon the will of legislative majorities. There is probably nothing for which the modern law-maker is worse fitted than the construction of an educational course or the selection of instructors, and yet questions of this sort are always liable to be raised in the State-house. The Texas Legislature last week spent hours in discussing the university of that commonwealth, a controversy having been precipitated by the charge that the professor of political economy was teaching "Northern ideas" regarding the struggle which ended in the civil war. The University of Washington, which was just gaining a respectable footing, has been utterly demoralized by the triumph of Populism last fall. The *Portland Oregonian* draws this melancholy picture of its present situation: "Deprived of the head to whom all its late and slow growth was due, made the spoil of patronage-traders and the refuge of place-seekers, defiled with nepotism by the Governor, whose chief charge it should be, and delivered bound and helpless to be stripped and torn and devoured by a flock of vulgar and greedy harpies forced into the board of regents, it has lost all standing as a place of learning and become the dirty nest of a brood of worthless sinecurists." The outlook is only less gloomy, according to the same authority, in Oregon, where the university "has had to fight for its very life against drowning in the dirty pool of State and local politics, and the outcome of the struggle is still in doubt." In Missouri and West Virginia, also, political bigotry is disorganizing the State educational institutions.

It is a healthy sign of the times that the Legislature of Illinois should have repealed, without any serious opposition, the law which requires the display of the national flag on all schools and public buildings. The statute was passed in Illinois, like similar ones in other

States, during recent years, under a sort of craze which swept over the country. These laws were based upon the theory that the only way to develop patriotism among the young was to keep the flag constantly before their eyes, and that we could not expect to have men ready to volunteer in case of war unless they saluted the colors at frequent intervals while they were boys. The impudence of this plea was only enhanced by the fact that we have still hundreds of thousands of survivors of the army which sprang to the defence of the Union in 1861, and which was composed of men who seldom saw the stars and stripes except on gala occasions. The truth is that the national flag is really cheapened by making it common, and that it is much more impressive to the young when it is displayed only on a national holiday, or on the anniversary of some historic event, than when they see it flying over the schoolhouse every day. The example of the Illinois Legislature in undoing the blunder of flag legislation merits general imitation.

The refusal of the Court of Appeals to grant a rehearing in the Brooklyn civil-service case was generally anticipated. A few weeks ago it would have been the final and serious decision of the most critical matter connected with the service, but the passage of Gov. Black's bill puts a new face on the whole question. He is introducing (except so far as his efforts are thwarted by city heads of departments who, like Messrs. Scott and Waring, surrender to the old City Commission their new powers) a totally novel system, which may turn out to be entirely unconstitutional. The Civil-Service Association will, as soon as possible, make a test case and let the courts determine whether the bill embodies a "competitive" system or not. The Court of Appeals in its late decision intimated that the Legislature had complete control of the details, but the judges have never held that this would permit the establishment of a system of sham competition, in which "merit" is distinguished from "fitness," and a board is directed to rate applicants while the right to determine the force of the rating is lodged in the appointing power, thus rendering the whole scheme nugatory. If this is competition, what is favoritism?

Mr. Low's strength as a candidate for the mayoralty of Greater New York is shown with especial clearness when one considers the straits to which it will put Tammany in the finding of an opponent to him. If Tammany nominates a man who is weak on the money question, it will send all the hard-money Democrats over to Mr. Low, to whom they are inclined naturally anyway. If it nominates a hard-money Democrat, it

will be in danger of losing a considerable body of Bryanite voters. If it nominates a German in order to attract German supporters because of dislike of the Raines law, there is likely to be trouble with the Irish vote. Yet it will have difficulty in getting the German vote without a candidate of that nationality. If it nominates a highly respectable man in order to gain the confidence of the respectable Democratic vote, there is danger of dissatisfaction and possible revolt among the masses who follow Tammany because it professes to be so "close to the people." The fact is that Mr. Low, by standing so preëminently for the issue of good government, and being so remarkably free from partisanship of any kind, is a natural magnet for the intelligent vote of all parties and of all nationalities. Thousands of Democrats will find it very hard to discover an excuse for not voting for him, especially with a Tammany candidate as the only alternative.

Mustapha Bey, the Turkish Minister at Washington, will have another chance to score off American sympathizers with the victims of the Sultan. He referred the other day to the Urbana lynching, when asked about Turkish outrages, and presently an even more brutal and shocking affair occurred in Maryland. A negro actually under sentence of death was torn from the officers of the law and kicked and strangled to death in broad daylight by an infuriated mob, not one man of whom even deigned to disguise himself. The Judge who had just sentenced the criminal to death, rushed out to implore the mob to let the law take its course, but was lucky to get off himself without lynching. These occurrences certainly give a queer look to our horror at Armenian massacres. If we content ourselves with protesting against our own lynchings, and disowning them, we are no better than the Sultan; he always protests against his own murderous exploits. If some of that Princess Anne mob cannot be brought to justice, why should any sentence of any court, or any law on the statute-book, be any longer respected or heeded in Maryland?

The remarks of Mr. Wilfred Laurier, the Canadian Premier, on British imperial unity are of the very highest significance. Most of the English colonies have been represented by their public men as anxious for an imperial customs union, under which England should impose duties on imports from foreign countries, while the colonies should retain their own protective systems. This policy has been the object of some coquettish sympathy on the part of the Tories, but, as the first step to be taken under it would be to levy a tax upon the bread of the English people, it has

never assumed a very definite shape. Mr. Chamberlain has been supposed to favor it, as he has intimated that he had something magnificent in view in the way of colonial policy; but if he has had any such plan in mind it would be ridiculous to propose it after Mr. Laurier's speech. That statesman declared plainly that a "Zollverein" was nothing but a name for protection, and that protection was an injurious humbug. It has been, as he said, the curse and bane of Canada, and it would be the greatest possible mistake for England and the empire. Canada has now turned her back on this pernicious fallacy, and has no disposition to ask England to adopt it, with the result of weakening herself and thereby injuring the whole empire, Canada included. "By our tariff," declared Mr. Laurier, "we in Canada give you preference as a free gift. We ask nothing in return; we do not desire you to abandon the grand principles of free trade; we desire rather to follow in your free-trade lead, trading where trading is most natural." As to the grand schemes of imperial naval defence, under which the West Indies are being fortified, and which have been supported by arguments very familiar to American ears, Mr. Laurier was equally chilling. The only country, he said, with which Canada could ever be at war would be the United States, and such a war would be a crime against humanity which he would not consider as a possibility against which precautions should be taken.

The return of the Conservative candidate for the Petersfield district of Hampshire by a majority of 420 in a poll of 7,076 is another indication, like the trouble over Crewe, of the drift away from the foreign policy of Lord Salisbury. In the last election, which settled the fate of home rule, the Conservative candidate was returned without opposition, and there was no evidence in this canvass of any dissatisfaction with the home policy of the Government. Indeed, the Nonconformist Unionist Association urged the support of Mr. W. G. Nicholson, the Conservative candidate, on the express ground that home rule must never again be allowed to show its head, while the campaign of his opponent, Mr. John Bonham-Carter, was made on foreign questions. Hampshire is naturally a Tory county, and the success of Mr. Nicholson by a small majority there cannot be very encouraging to his party. There is no trace yet in England of anything but dissatisfaction with the part it is playing in Europe.

The suicide of the man who for the last ten years has been the great diamond millionaire and operator of the world fixes public attention for a few hours upon a very remarkable career.

It is one of those careers which "read like a fairy story" or a tale of the Arabian Nights. The rise, splendor, and downfall of the hero show the ease with which wealth in our day is rapidly acquired, brings in its wake sudden fame and position, and is as suddenly followed by total ruin and collapse. Barney never cared much for respectability, but he dearly liked the notice of respectable people, for that was the one thing he had never had in his early days. He got it in abundance. Not only all the bankers and "financiers," but many of the dwellers in the great London houses, came to see and honor him, and, but for his own somewhat natural incapacity for taking himself seriously, he might gradually have outgrown even his name, and become Sir Barnet Barnato, or sunk it altogether in a title. He seems to have thought of paving the way for a creditable old age by giving out a "history of his life," in which he claimed a good family connection, and accounted for the earlier years of his life as having been passed in the care of "private tutors." But the joke was too good to keep to himself, and he spoilt the effect of his biography by laughing over it with his friends. The climax of this part of his career came when he was entertained at the Mansion House by the Lord Mayor, and heard himself and his operations lauded to the skies. At that moment he was one of the most powerful men in the world.

Defenders of the duel may well be pleased with the result of the meeting which took place on June 2 between Count de Montesquiou and Henri de Regnier. It seems that De Regnier's sister-in-law, at a *conversazione*, "turned the conversation on a cane carried by the Count," remarking that it was "just the sort of cane that might have been used at the Charity Bazaar fire to beat the ladies," *innuendo*, as the lawyers say, that the Count was one of the brutes who maltreated women in order to escape. The remark was resented by the Count, and he at once challenged De Regnier, who had been present when it was made. De Regnier, who appears to be a sensible man, allowed his seconds to propose an arbitration; upon which the Count "branded" him as a coward, and, according to French ideas, practically forced him to fight. The duel was a real one, but the Count was disabled by a wound in the hand, and so, unluckily for him, escaped death. To those interested in social survivals, it is curious to notice how freely the ladies' names were dragged into the affair and bandied about. The old idea that men engaged in a quarrel caused by a woman should be careful to keep her out of it—sometimes pushed so far that a different cause of quarrel was invented in order to shelter the lady—seems to be quite out of date.

MR. McKINLEY'S HAWAIIAN POLICY.

All accounts agree that the President will send to the Senate a treaty for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. Just when he will do it, and just in what terms the treaty will be couched, are, of course, secrets as yet. But they are unimportant secrets. The main thing is the deliberate entrance by the Administration upon a policy of annexation and colonial expansion. At the time of the Hawaiian flurry four years ago, a vast amount of partisan intrigue and passion entered into the question. Baffled conspirators and foiled plunderers always rage and lift up their voices when they see their prey plucked from between their very jaws, and much of the hysterics over President Cleveland's Hawaiian policy was but the sincere anguish of men who saw good things, and, as they had thought, sure things, slipping away from them. But all that heat is past. The original conspiracy to overthrow the Hawaiian Government and steal away the islands, in which the American Minister participated, does not now enter directly into the question. With the slate sponged clean, Mr. McKinley has undertaken to write on it a policy entirely new for the United States.

To what motives or to what pressure he has yielded it is not for us to say. He had given many to understand that he was radically opposed to annexation. When, in his inaugural address, he warned his countrymen against "the temptation of territorial aggression," he was thought to have Hawaii in mind. His choice of a Secretary of State who was on record against annexation was supposed to look the same way. In private he has given assurances which were taken to mean uncompromising hostility to all kinds of foreign embroilment and to Hawaiian annexation in particular. But the country has found out, what students of McKinley's career were well persuaded of, that his faculty of adapting his words to his hearers does not at all imply that he has a will of his own against Congress or against the masterful leaders of his party. Boileau was once discussing a grammatical point with the Prince of Condé, who grew violent. The poet sarcastically apologized, saying, "I shall hereafter always take good care to agree with you when you are angry." Mr. McKinley always agrees with conventions and parties—and even visitors—that are really angry.

Though time has taken most of the fury out of the Hawaiian question, it has not in the least diminished the objections to Hawaiian annexation. These objections relate both to the annexation itself and to what it signifies for the future. No one pretends that the population of the islands is a desirable addition. According to the latest census, ta-

ken within a year, it consists of 109,020 souls, of whom the full-blooded natives number 31,000, the Japanese 24,000, the Chinese 22,000, the Portuguese 15,000, half-breed Hawaiians 8,000, with scattering Americans, English, Germans, etc. What are we going to do with these mixed races? Evidently the Chinese and Japanese will have to go. Any treaty must leave the laws of the United States supreme over the territory annexed, and our laws do not admit of the incoming of Chinese laborers, or, constructively, of Japanese. So the first thing we should have to do would be to give these 50,000 Orientals a week's notice to quit. Then we could, with fresh enthusiasm, pass resolutions against the expulsion of the Jews from Russia and the Armenian deportations. Hawaii is to be given a "territorial government," it is said. But is this to be under the present laws practically disfranchising the natives? Are the Portuguese to retain the suffrage, and be allowed to outvote the handful of Americans? And how long will it be before Hawaii is a full-fledged State, and before our Presidential elections will turn on the ability of Hawaiian bosses to "swing" the Portuguese or the Hula vote?

These are only a few of the practical difficulties of annexation that leap to every one's mind. But the objections to annexation *per se*, strong as they are, weigh little compared with those to the policy of which annexation is but the first step. In the first place, it will give a new fillip to our already excessive and alarming national extravagance and overweening arrogance and aggressiveness. Eager Congressmen, with the usual contractors behind them, are already exulting over Hawaii as a splendid place to spend money. There are harbors to be improved and fortified, and channels to be dredged, and railroads to be built, and cables to be laid, and coaling stations to be provided. All this means more ships and more bump-tiousness. One little group of islands will do very well for a while, but soon others will have to be exploited, and we shall enter upon a glorious course of "land-grabbing." Cuba will come in, of course, and San Domingo and Hayti and St. Thomas; nor will the mainland of Central and South America long escape our covetous eyes. There may still be a United States, but it will not be the United States we now know.

People talk about the grand civilizing and protecting mission of the United States. We are not to shrink selfishly and timidly within our own borders, but are to go forth, as a state-errant, to redress the wrongs of other countries, to rescue the oppressed, and, incidentally, to take their land. That is what is called the "reason of state" which has to override the ordinary reasons. But reason of state is a Machiavellian phrase which, as John Morley said in his re-

cent lecture on the author of 'The Prince,' is translated in practice into reason of party, and that into reason of plunder. That is the great difficulty with this theory of our international mission. The mission is a grandiose conception; but there is nothing grandiose about the missionaries who are to execute it. What they have in their minds is a remorseless trampling upon native rights, opportunities for personal enrichment, readiness to pick a quarrel with every nation that gets in their way, and an era of general national extravagance and waste and oppressive taxation. That, in plain terms, is what the benevolent mission of the United States will come to in execution—its tender mercies proving cruel—and that is the end to which the Hawaiian beginning will surely conduct us.

A SOUTH AMERICAN ERROR.

Most of the speeches made at the Pan-American dinner here last Thursday were essentially the same speeches that have been made at other banquets of the same kind before. There was the funny speech about the "dark-eyed señoritas" from our witty Mayor; there was the familiar speech—this time from Mr. Romero—pointing out that one reason why we have so little trade with South America is that Americans "do not pack goods in convenient form," and "do not consult the taste of the people to whose wants they are trying to cater," and "do not give the banking facilities and credits that are cheerfully allowed by England." Seth Low made the speech pointing out that "foreign trade broadens the national mind." Arthur Hitchens of Rio predicted that trade was increasing and would increase. Ex-Mayor Grace reminded his audience that the people of Spanish America were "always eager for whatever is good and useful," and declared that we would see that they had it. Mr. Fernandez of Costa Rica lamented the lack of steamship lines. Mr. Oscar Straus made the speech in favor of international arbitration, pointing out that the historical tie which binds South America to us is founded upon our intervention in 1823 against the Holy Alliance, that our mission is a peaceful one, that "America for the Americans" does not mean a bellicose but a peaceful policy, and that the true way to build up trade and to strengthen our hold in this hemisphere is to improve our consular and diplomatic service. Mr. Warner Miller repeated, in his own fascinating way, what the others had said before.

It was a glorious occasion, and will, we have no doubt, like the Philadelphia festivity at which the President explained his views on the same subject, do much to encourage all good Pan-Americans. What we miss, however, is a speech elucidating to the South Ame-

rican mind a point which both Señor Mendonça and Señor Romero have evidently failed to grasp—that we have a system of trade and commerce which we are extending and applying as fast as possible, that it is one which is novel and peculiar, and that its nature makes our method of extending trade on this continent different from that fostered by European nations.

The South Americans are clearly of opinion that a nation which wants to trade with another can go to work only in one way, by encouraging the building of ships to carry its products, by establishing a thoroughly good consular and diplomatic service so that it may have the best sources of official information, and by so arranging its tariff as to tax lightly all the imports which form the raw materials of its manufactures. This is the European way, and the Europeans, by pursuing it steadily for fifty years, have filled South American ports with their ships, established everywhere markets for their manufactures, become the bankers and money-lenders of all South American countries, and have made the connection between South America and Europe as close as ours is distant and shadowy.

But was it to be expected that we would lightly admit that the European way was the only way? Not by any means. We have a system of our own, which has not really had a chance yet, but which is in operation, and must very soon produce some striking effects. We will endeavor to describe it.

Every one admits that what is wanted is to build up trade with South America, and this means that we must have a great export of manufactures to South America. It would be idle to learn how to pack goods to suit the taste of the Venezuelans or Brazilians if they don't want our goods at all. We have hardly any merchant marine, and to wait to build up trade till we have one, especially when the ships of all the world are ready to carry our cargoes, would be the height of folly. For the same reason, although our diplomatic and consular service might be improved, trade cannot wait for that; if trade is ready, the improved consuls and ministers must follow in its wake.

For this reason every one is agreed that we must stimulate imports. The error of the South Americans and even of our own statesmen like Warner Miller lies in not seeing that we are stimulating imports. No doubt they have some excuse. The old object of protection was to keep out imports, and, by keeping them out, to stimulate the employment of American capital and American labor in the production of things needed for the American market. But the tariff at the present day is used for a purpose entirely different. A modern tariff has two main objects. One is to get money to elect a worthy President,

the other is the even higher and nobler aim of forcing people to import. The moment the fact is stated, the truth of the observation must be apparent to every impartial person. We have now had a tariff in preparation for several months, and the main questions involved are what taxes shall be laid on wool and sugar. No sooner had the discussion begun than the wool ships began to crowd into Boston and the sugar ships into Philadelphia. Fleet upon fleet came crowding in, until it is said that we have enough wool in the country to supply the mills for three years and enough sugar to supply the refiners for a year. What is true of wool and sugar is also true of hides and lumber and all the varied products of the earth. This was the object of the retroactive clause.

This is Trade. It makes no difference how the things come in if they do come in. The European way may do very well in Europe, but the South Americans must not expect us to introduce it here. We prefer our own way, which is to threaten to change our whole tariff about every four years and to threaten such monstrous rates of duty as to drive every one who has got a mill or a factory in this country to import like mad, and "stock up" with material enough to last him until the next change. This works in two ways. He must import, while he can, in advance, but the great merit of this scheme is that he *must sell* before the next election. A man who not only must import but must sell cannot avoid trading.

This is our system. It may not be perfect, but we like it and shall not hastily change it for Señor Romero, or Señor Mendonça, or any other "dago" minister. To whom it first occurred we do not know, but Dingley brought it to perfection, and is said to have stocked his own mill under it. It ought to make this country the "workshop of the world," as England has been hitherto. It is wiping out the deficit at the same time. The great beauty of the system is that it does not conflict with any other branch of American policy. Formerly we used to be warned against the dastardly business of importing goods to compete with American manufacturers. But those goods supply the material for American manufacturers. As

The stately ships go on to their haven under the hill, we can gloat, as we watch them, over the fact that they are all foreign bottoms, that they all fly European flags, and yet all bring grist to our mills. Under this system we shall, in fact, never require any ships at all, and as trade is really made compulsory we do not need any improved consuls or ministers. Our manufacturers, too, will probably in turn learn how to pack, for that is one of the necessities of trade, and must follow it. Nor will the system interfere with the "new navy." We can have as many ironclads as we like,

and can send them about the world, with patriot officers to shout defiance at our customers from behind big guns in every port in Christendom.

A FREE-WOOL LESSON FROM GERMANY.

"Made in Germany" has come to be regarded as synonymous with cheapness. The rapid stimulation of manufactures in the Empire soon led to a production greater than the domestic markets could absorb, and a vent in foreign lands became necessary. The task of obtaining a hold in neutral markets was undertaken systematically and intelligently, and was supported by grants of money from the imperial Government. Everywhere the activity and persistence of the trained "drummer" of Germany were felt, and even in English mercantile houses in South America the German clerk found a ready admittance. His training and singleness of purpose made him valuable as an ally and dangerous as a rival. As a result of this combination of commercial education and Government recognition, Germany has built up a great export trade in manufactured articles, and nearly two-thirds of the value of her entire exports is represented by these articles. That the basis of this trade is in a measure artificial cannot be denied; but eliminating what is factitious, there remains enough to excite our admiration at the rapid industrial development of Germany.

This development rests notably upon the fact that Germany recognizes to the fullest extent the necessity for admitting the raw materials of manufactures free of any duty or charge. All the great articles of the world's commerce in a crude or raw condition are admitted into Germany free of duty; and extreme as the protective policy of the Empire is and has been, these materials have escaped taxation. With the growth of an export trade in finished products there has been an even greater growth in the imports of raw materials; and this has without doubt done much to recommend German manufactures to countries which had raw materials to sell. Nothing could do more to open foreign markets than a policy of free raw materials, and there is little question that our competitors have gained more by such a political instrument than the United States can ever hope to gain under a combination of a protective tariff and a nondescript and impracticable "reciprocity" system. As ex-Secretary Olney recently said in Philadelphia, foreign markets are rarely, almost never, effectively shut to the United States by the direct action of any foreign country:

"When the doors are really closed, it is almost always by our own act, by legislation which seems offensive to foreign States, which puts their products under a sort of

ban and excludes them from our markets, and which disables their citizens from buying of us by disabling them from selling to us. Surely any such policy effectually arrests the development of trade, and, if ever justified by extraordinary and temporary conditions, is to be strictly limited by the requirements of these conditions."

With this deliberate policy of enabling the German manufacturer to make his goods cheaply, at a low cost, it is natural to find Germany of great commercial importance wherever an opening is offered. The measure of the true reduction of duties on manufactures of wool made by our tariff of 1894 may be obtained from the resulting movements in German woollens. In the last ten years the highest value of wool manufactures (other than yarn) was reached in 1888 with \$59,024,000. The greatest weight of these goods was sent out in 1892—65,285,000 pounds—but the value represented was only \$50,932,000. The exports for 1895 showed an increase in weight over 1892—70,000,000 pounds—and a small increase in total value, \$51,646,000. Measured in bulk, the movement in 1895 was larger than ever before, but measured in value it was much less than in 1888. This was to be expected because of the great fall in prices throughout the world since 1893.

How far this general increase of exports was reflected in the special exports to the United States may be seen from the following comparison of quantities of the leading items in 1892 and 1895:

	1892. Lbs.	1895. Lbs.
Felts	1,540	1,980
Flushes	29,780	143,220
Fringes and button cover- ings	128,920	85,580
Knit goods, printed	1,320	6,380
Knit goods, unprinted	616,440	1,206,040
Dress goods, printed	121,660	156,420
Dress goods, unprinted	6,220,060	10,412,160
Shawls	6,160	4,400
Laces, etc.	1,540	3,740
Foot Mats	14,620	71,720

In testing this apparent growth of exports to the United States allowance must be made for the economic conditions prevailing in 1892 and 1895. In the former year the situation here encouraged large imports, for the unwholesome stimulus of overproduction under the tariff law of 1890 was making itself felt. Every branch of import trade was feverishly excited, and the amount of goods brought in was exaggerated by the zeal of the many seeking to take advantage of the good prices. A reaction followed, and in 1894 the exports of woollens to the United States were as far below a normal average as those of 1892 had been above it. In 1895 an effort was made to make up for a part of this difference, and the imports for that year were really the imports for nearly one and one-half years. In that view the figures are not excessive in most of the articles. In others, the increase may be explained by fashion and a true cheapness of production attained by a careful study of technical detail and by the free admission of raw wools.

Turning to the trade returns of the United States, the figures may be

brought down to a later date. In 1895 the imports of woollens from Germany were valued at \$8,577,097, which was only \$80,000 greater than the value of the imports of 1892. The "starved" condition of markets due to the exhausting influence of a financial crisis and a bitter contest over the tariff was not made good in 1895, and the small imports of 1894 (\$5,123,441) were not balanced till 1896, when \$11,658,949 in woollens were imported. Since last July the imports have been much less than in the corresponding period of 1895-'96, showing that there is no danger of a "flooding" of our market, as the high protectionist claims.

Whatever has been the advantage gained in our markets by the wool-manufacturers of Germany is due to the admission of raw wools into that country free of duty. Without that advantage they would have been unable to compete with England and France, for the fall in the price of raw wools since 1893 would have increased the burden of their disadvantage. Without free wool they would have been confined to their own home markets, and that would mean widespread ruin and eventually a concentration of the industry in a Trust combination. Yet this is exactly what Congress is imposing upon the United States by the proposed specific duties on raw wools. The prices of Australian wool may fall one-half, but the American manufacturer finds little advantage in it, as the duty has been doubled in burden. He is incapable of meeting his foreign competitor in foreign markets, and he depends upon Congress for protection against foreign goods in his own market. He cannot choose his wools to suit his cloth, for the duties are prohibitory on certain grades; so he cannot hope to avail himself of every circumstance of supply as can his rivals. He finds domestic production stimulated and the margin of profit reduced by the domestic competition, by which he loses the advantages expected of the home market. In short, he is heavily handicapped, and all at the demand of an industry that no possible tariff can benefit.

MAXIMS.

A fondness for maxims and a readiness in applying them in situations of doubt and difficulty have always been marks of political intelligence. By maxims we do not mean common proverbs, such as "A fool and his money are soon parted," or "A man is known by the company he keeps," or "You can't eat your cake and have it"—these are in general use, and are applied constantly, with great force and point, by very ordinary, plain people in the way of criticism of the doings of their friends and neighbors. We have in mind maxims or gnomic sayings of a higher order, aphorisms which only guides and teach-

ers utter. They are usually couched in carefully considered language, are sometimes pointed by means of alliteration and antithesis, and are uttered only on important occasions. They are generally designed to encourage, warn, cheer, instruct, and throw light on practical questions, and there can be no doubt that in politics they are every year playing a more and more striking part. Their use is not confined to either party, but for some reason the Republicans are, just now, far more adept in their use than the Democrats. Indeed, with that boldness for which they are famous, they invented one some years ago which was employed to discredit at one blow all the pestilential heresies of free trade and the economic phrases in which it masquerades. "The tariff is a question of markets, not of maxims." It was a great man who said this, great enough to risk the retort that his phrase itself was a maxim. Another saying, the echo of which has not yet died away, was that a cheap coat might cover a cheap man. Never uttered before, no sooner did it fall upon the ears of a listening party than they cried with a loud voice, That settles it.

In a period of maxims it always happens that some thinkers develop especial talent for their production. For some reason the great maxim periods have always been those in which popular government has flourished, no doubt because popular government, being wiser than any other, produces more evidences of wisdom. At any rate, aristocracies and monarchies have produced few great maxim-makers. In the United States if we ask ourselves from what quarter it would be most likely that maxims should come, and who would be likely to be best at them, we should not be wrong in considering it probable that the President himself, under certain circumstances, would be likely to be especially gifted in this way. He stands in a peculiar relation to the people, being elected by them to carry out a platform which is drawn up by somebody else, and to do this by means of a Legislature over which he has little or no control. This situation of trust and confidence, combined with a certain sense of impotence, tends to reflection. He ponders on high affairs of state, and is looked to somewhat irrationally to settle the Cuban question, or to introduce bimetallism, to see a tariff passed, to have the currency reformed, and in general to restore "prosperity," though those who hang upon every word which comes from him really have intrusted these matters in great part to representatives of their own over whom he has little influence. Under these circumstances, some Presidents have said almost nothing. Washington and Cleveland became more and more silent as time went on. Lincoln diverted attention by making jokes. Mr. McKinley

has obviously perceived that the true resource of a good man in such a situation is maxims.

He began, however, when he was a candidate for the Presidency, with campaign maxims, which are of a different sort. When he said, "It is better to open the mills than to open the mints," a whole campaign may be said to have been summed up. It was mildly put, yet it embodied a truth which was undeniable. Even Bryan had not the hardihood to attempt refutation. Blackburn, armed to the teeth, would have hesitated to maintain that it was better to close the mills, or a matter of no consequence whether they were open or not, or that opening the mints would make mills unnecessary. They had no reply to make except the argument that opening the mints would open the mills. But, too stupid to think of saying that, all that they could do was to cry, "You shall not crucify labor upon a cross of gold"; but this was a metaphor, and a metaphor cannot refute a maxim. On the whole, this maxim must stand as one of the most effective in the history of the country. It brought the issues clearly before the minds of the public, without stating them at all, or binding anybody to any particular scheme, and put the Democrats in a false position.

A post-election maxim, as we have said, is not of this kind. It is not so pointed or witty, and is designed, not for victory, but for meditation. It encourages hope rather than struggle, and reconciles the mind to the inevitable. But, as in the case of all good maxims, it is incontrovertible. Some of the wisest and best post-election maxims ever produced have been uttered since his inauguration by Mr. McKinley. A very striking one occurred in his speech on "Prosperity" at Philadelphia—"The maker must find the taker." This means that there cannot be any considerable product of manufactures unless there are consumers ready, *i. e.*, provided with ample capital, to purchase them. That this is the true signification is enforced by the amplification, "You will not employ labor to make a product unless you can find a buyer for that product after labor has made it"; but, with the keen instinct of the orator, Mr. McKinley perceived that a paraphrase like this would not fasten itself in the mind and memory even of a Philadelphian audience, and hence an antithesis must be flashed on the screen. Here is one coined for all time and any occasion: "The maker must find the taker." It is so true that even the converse cannot be disputed. It is also true that the taker must find the maker.

Another maxim of importance occurs in the same speech: "Resuscitation will not be promoted by recrimination." This is at once a maxim and a metaphor. It means that if you desire to revive a subject from collapse, the chances of

success will not be enhanced by a quarrel over the cause of the collapse. The orator sees before him the corpse of American prosperity, and hears two sets of political doctors quarrelling with one another, and each accusing the other of having caused the fatality. He sees at once that this course is fraught with danger, and recalls the country to a sense of the real nature of the situation. Who ever heard of resuscitation being promoted by recrimination? Yet who ever said it before?

"The distrust of the present will not be removed by a distrust of the future" has the incontrovertibility of the best maxims, and it also may be reversed, for it is equally true that distrust of the future will not be removed by distrust of the present; but as the words present and future do not begin with the same letter, it is not as pointed as the next: "A patriot makes a better citizen than a pessimist." This is the pure milk of the word. The passage ends with a fine burst—"The country is not going backwards, but forwards." This, however, is not a maxim, but a peroration. The antithesis between the patriot and the pessimist is, we believe, wholly new, and, once stated, needs no argument to enforce it. It throws the burden on the other side. Let the rascal come forward who maintains that the pessimist makes a better citizen than a patriot. Let him, if he can, support his contention. How will he do it? Where will he find hearers? How will he avoid contempt when he is heard?

MR. BAYARD'S ADMONITION.

The reception given on Saturday night to Mr. Bayard by the National Civic Club of Brooklyn was in every respect gratifying. It would not be easy to name any American who so well as Mr. Bayard represents the statesmanship of an earlier, and in some vital particulars a better, day in our national development. His long political career began in the time of republican simplicity, when the functions of the general Government were regarded as strictly limited by the Constitution; and when the extravagant expenditure and oppressive taxation from which we now suffer would have almost caused a popular rebellion. The political traditions in which he was trained were those of freedom. He was brought up in a school of statesmanship which held to the theory that government, as it involved the restraint of citizens by authority, should be carefully restricted to such measures as were universally admitted to be necessary, and should not be allowed to employ its coercive powers in the interest of particular classes or particular individuals. This fundamental doctrine, the fundamental doctrine of the Democratic party, and indeed the fundamental principle of sound

popular government, is by the present leaders of both parties either openly repudiated or quietly abandoned. That its oldest and most dignified representative should be selected for especial honor by an association of earnest and patriotic reformers, is a sign that we need not despair of the republic.

The statesmanship of which Mr. Bayard is a type differs also from the present style in that it implies true leadership. When we consider the position of many of our public men, even the most prominent of them, we are reminded of the story of the French revolutionist who pointed to a group of men at a barricade, exclaiming, "Il faut bien les suivre! Je suis leur chef." The aim of those who for the present take the place of leaders is to find out what is popular, to learn what cry will be most taking with the press and the politicians, and to join in that. Mr. Bayard still preserves the traditions of a period when public men appeared as the advocates of principles which they explained to and urged upon the people, instead of posturing as mere vehicles of supposed popular demands. The maxim of modern statesmen in too many cases seems to be, "Find out what the people desire, and proclaim that they must have it," instead of, "Find out what the people really need, and insist that they must learn to desire it." It was hardly to be expected that a statesman accustomed to these old standards, and devoted to the exposure of the fallacies of protection, should suppress his convictions even at his post as Ambassador, merely because of a sudden change in the political complexion of Congress.

As to our present situation, Mr. Bayard's words were singularly forcible and impressive. His declaration that the most dangerous abuse of our government consists in taking public property for private use, is one of those effective generalizations that will pass into the common speech of men. It is this abuse that especially threatens the stability of institutions founded on the theory of equal rights, and that especially injures the weaker members of the community. "There must be some hand to hold the scales aloft out of the reach of the strong and the rapacious and the ambitious, otherwise the weak, feeble, and poorer members of society have an additional weight added to their inequalities." The true nobility of the American system lay in its just recognition of manhood and denial of privilege. Standing on this firm foundation, Mr. Bayard made an appeal to his countrymen which may well be taken as a summary of democratic doctrine.

"The great charter excludes 'titles of nobility,' and the whole instrument is luminous with the intent to prevent unequal favors or unequal burdens among its citizens. Therefore, I earnestly insist and prayerfully entreat my countrymen to take firm, early, and uncompromising stand in opposition to and denial of every claim by

legislative or executive power which contains the fatal principle that the sovereign power of taxation can be controlled or used for private advantage; and any law which is stained by such purposes and has such results should be removed from the statute-books. It is a law of political health that the results of lawful industry should inure to the hand or brain that worked to produce them, and when the powers of government are substituted for individual endeavor, the virus of socialistic interference and the tyranny which is its inevitable companion enter the veins of the body politic. I say this with the present proceedings of Congress in full view, and in a session in which the corner-stone of public safety, the very keystone of public credit, has not only not received the cold respect of a passing notice, but such measures of cruel and excessive taxation are pending, with threatened success, as must decrease our foreign commerce, increase our commercial isolation, and cause retaliatory legislation by nations who are seeking friendly and reciprocal relations with our people. Such measures are the fruitful parents of just discontent among the wage-earning and agricultural classes of our countrymen, and blind are those who will not see the immediate danger they constitute to the public credit."

Mr. Bayard's account of his foreign stewardship is simple and dignified. He declined, as he said, to recognize the distinction which had been made by those who had referred to him as the Ambassador of good feeling rather than of diplomacy. He has distinguished himself and honored his country not in being the representative of the passions and jealousies and animosities of his countrymen, or of the ambitions, prejudices, or selfish interests of individuals or classes, but in being the exponent in courtesy and in good faith of the kindly affections and natural affinities of the two great English-speaking nations. He may justly say that this policy has promoted international good will and good understanding, and that there are to-day no questions between us and Great Britain that do not admit of easy settlement. Such purposes as these, pursued as Mr. Bayard has pursued them, will indeed create an international tranquillity; but we cannot altogether concede that "the personal fame and renown of the agent will disappear in the calm sea of public safety, welfare, and content." To have maintained diplomatic intercourse on the high plane on which Mr. Bayard has maintained it under the trying conditions of the last few years, is an achievement that his countrymen will not forget.

THE GLUT OF TALENT.

The approaching Jubilee has, of course, started many pens summing up Victorian this, that, and the other, from drinking habits to telegraphing, from ships to books. Victorian literature has been a favorite subject for this kind of extensive viewing, and as good a thing in that line as we have seen is Mr. H. D. Traill's article in the June *Fortnightly*. He makes out roughly three periods of twenty years each, the first of which, 1837 to 1857, was marked by, on the whole, the best work of Tennyson,

Browning, Carlyle, Macaulay, Dickens, Thackeray, and Ruskin. Then came two decades of comparative sterility, literature appearing, with a few great exceptions, to be "hanging in the wind." The last twenty years, Mr. Traill declares, are chiefly notable for the rise of a large class of second-rate writers. Poets were never so numerous who, with all their technical facility and excellence, must still be called minor; prose-writers have enormously increased, and display by the thousand a competent workmanship which requires a careful examination if one is to discriminate between the merits of the form and the demerits of the matter.

This great and general improvement in writing English, merely as writing, seems fairly made out. As Mr. Traill remarks, the descent from a writer of the first class to one of the second is not to-day so long and abrupt a step as it was in the beginning of the century. Our best poets are only a little better than our second-best; whereas, thirty or forty years ago, to pass from Tennyson to the minor poets of the time was "to feel as if you had been kicked down a long flight of steps and had alighted in the Poet's Corner of an obscure provincial newspaper." As for the extraordinary development and spread of novel-writing, in plausible forms which it takes an expert to tell from the genuine article, every one knows, many from a sad experience, about that. Whether popular education, democracy, the *Zeit-Geist*, or the Prince of Darkness is chiefly responsible for all this, it is not necessary to inquire. More important is it for us to understand the perils of this literary phenomenon, and one of the greatest of these Mr. Traill points out in the following judicious language:

"Undoubtedly it is upon the critic who strives to keep a level head and a judgment free from prejudice that the present condition of English literature most embarrassingly tells. For if the democratic movement has made for the wider diffusion of the literary faculty, it has on the other hand infected the published estimates of literary productions with the peculiar and characteristic vices of democracy—with its vehemence, its ignorance, its inconsistency, its insatiable thirst for the sensational, its vulgar admiration for artistic vulgarity, its utter lack of measure and reserve. From the exaggerated eulogy, the shameless *réclame* which attends even the most moderate of contemporary successes in literature, sober criticism revolts. The artistic extravagances and violence into which every new writer, whether with ability or without, is tempted by the drum-beating showman of the press to endeavor to catch the popular taste, unceasingly multiply; and it needs a determined fairmindedness on the part of the critic to refrain from judging the whole literary movement of the time by these repellent incidents."

The argument of our big-drum critics seems to be that because we have so much talent we must have a good deal of genius. In the days when there were undoubted giants in the land, there were but few others who could write passably well; now that so many can write passably well, there must be many

of the full stature of genius. At any rate, let us say so. Let us not be caught napping. By crowning every new writer as a genius, we shall escape the ignominy of letting a genius grow up among us unacclaimed. Our critical laurels are so easily transferred from head to head that clapping them on the wrong brows time after time does not really matter. Everybody will have forgotten our prophecies and our adjectives of a year ago, and they can be applied with just as triumphant an air of fresh discovery to the next man. Above all, let us be insistent and unqualified and noisy—in other words, import the methods of the Salvation Army into criticism.

The loudest clashing of the big cymbals that we have lately had to listen to is in the article in the June *Forum* on "Contemporary American Essayists." We say nothing about the fact that the essay is a literary form as extinct as the Dodo. We have monographs; we have lectures and "articles" and meditations and studies and scrapings from our commonplace books; but the Essay, properly speaking, we do not have any more. Waiving all these matters of definition, however, the generous assignment of literary immortality which this *Forum* writer makes is too much. It is too good to be true. We have not a word to say against any of the essayists invited in such crowds into the Pantheon, but we are sure that not all of them could get in or would feel at home there if they could. In fact, the writer himself seems conscious that he has overdone it, and admits that "perhaps none among us is making such permanent contributions to literature as Emerson or Lowell or Poe"; but he hastens to add: "Yet one cannot resist a suspicion that these profit a little by distance, and that as our own writers recede there may remain work done in this decade that, as criticism, may rank with the very best."

This is delightful—the best test and proof of solid merit turned into a gentle disparagement. Why have not Tupper and Bailey, why have not Willis and Halleck, profited by distance? They have "receded" into that maw of time and oblivion whither the productions of all mere talent hurry; whither they hurry in these days of a glut of talent faster than ever; whither nine out of ten of the books mentioned by the *Forum* writer have already gone irrecoverably. *Les morts vont vite*, and the death-rate among books is something appalling in our time; especially are contemporary American essayists a bad risk. Hardly have our Salvation-Army critics done shouting over the genius who is to live for ever, before he is gone and the memory of him blotted out. Mr. Traill is right. We must keep our heads in spite of the din. The trick of writing well is easily

caught; but if a man has nothing to say, he might as well never have got beyond sign-language. There are critical standards not yet swept away by the critics' floods of verbiage; and the resolute clinging to them is the first literary duty of the hour.

IRISH AFFAIRS.

DUBLIN, June 1, 1897.

In 1886 Lord Randolph Churchill, as leader of the Conservatives in the House of Commons, said: "The great sign-posts of our policy in Ireland are equality, similarity, and simultaneity of treatment, as far as is practicable, in the establishment of a universally popular system of local government in all the four countries which form the United Kingdom." Two years later he charged his late colleagues with deliberate breach of faith in this matter, and now, nine years later still, Ireland still has a promise dangled twelve months in advance before her.

The one subject on which there has been an abundance of legislation during the last thirty years is the land question, and of that our lawgivers have made a most hopeless muddle. English reformers of the stamp of John Bright and Richard Cobden taught that "free trade in land" must be the basis of any sound system of land tenure. Cobden maintained that the interests of landlord and tenant must necessarily be antagonistic. The Royal Commission that preceded the great Land Act of 1881 pointed out that to set landlords and tenants at law with each other would never settle the land question. Representative landlords like Lord Dufferin and The O'Connor Don, who took part in that inquiry, expressed the same opinion. The Land League proposed a large but gradual scheme of expropriation of the landlord class; Mr. Parnell over and over again warned the English Government that the interests of landlord and tenant were irreconcilable, and that the periodical settlement of fair rents by Government tribunals would end in failure. Twenty-five Irish land acts have been passed at Westminster in the last thirty years, their contested passage having occupied a most undue proportion of Parliamentary time, and yet the Irish land question remains a thorn in the side of Parliament, as unsettled as ever. Neither the theories of English reformers nor the wishes of the Irish people have been attended to. One remarkable result of all this legislation is that landlords' estates have been made absolutely unmarketable. The art of selling great estates, as Mr. Sexton once said in Parliament, is a lost one, and as for Bright's free trade in land, the transfer of real estate is as troublesome and costly as ever. The landlord class is doubly hit, first by the reduction of rents, due to the general fall in prices; secondly because their lowered rents have become unsalable, and are no longer a security on which loans can be obtained at almost any rate of interest, although in England the rate of interest on mortgages has fallen to nearly half what it used to be.

As a class, the landlords have opposed every reform that was ever proposed, and the mutilation in the House of Lords of such measures as got through the House of Commons has tended to keep up the agitation against them, as well as against the system

of which they are a part. A case now before the Court of Bankruptcy illustrates the effect of the system under which Irish landlords take no part in the management of their estates, but leave the only management there is, the collection of rents, to land-agents. The bankrupt in the present case was one of the largest, best known, and most unpopular agents in the eastern counties. He stated in his examination that for eight years he was under close protection by police and military. At least three of his employers were members of the House of Lords; but, while pressing the tenants to pay with extreme harshness, he was appropriating a considerable share of the profits of the estates to his own private use. In the period to which the examination referred he admitted the appropriation to his own purposes of \$40,000 of his employers' rents. He held upwards of forty-six agencies, and it appears to have been a common practice to exact for his own use fines or premiums in addition to the rent when letting vacant farms. He thus had a very direct interest in making farms vacant by eviction, and but for the bankruptcy proceedings these frauds would never have been discovered by his clients.

The land act passed last year has now been nine months in operation. It was intended, and so far as words could make the issue clear it directed the land courts, to separate distinctly the property of the tenant, in such improvements as he had made, from the landlord's property in the land itself. The courts have, however, minimized its effect, and in practice little change has been made. But the landlords, taking advice from Lord Salisbury, have commenced an agitation against both the law and its administration. The Government has promised a royal commission to investigate the matter. The same course was pursued in 1882; no sooner was the act of 1881 in operation than the landlords had a committee of the House of Lords appointed to condemn the administration of the courts. The result was that in 1887 more than one Land Commissioner admitted that impossibly high rents had been fixed because the courts were intimidated by the action of the House of Lords.

It may seem surprising that men in a judicial position could be intimidated or controlled by the Government, for the theory of the British Constitution is that such persons are independent of the Crown and Government of the day. The Assistant Land Commissioners, however, are practically removable at will; most of them are appointed for one year, and their appointment is renewed or not each year at the will of the Government; some are employed and paid by the day. The "removable" magistrates under the Coercion Act were another example of the same principle. There have been several instances of these removable Commissioners being discharged at the end of a year of office without any fault alleged, but it was well known that complaints had been secretly made to the Government by landlords who thought themselves aggrieved. Nearly all the present Commissioners have been appointed by the Conservative Government, and yet the landlords, the thick-and-thin supporters of this Government, are denouncing the decisions of these men as unjust, and calling for an intimidatory inquiry into their proceedings.

On the eve of the celebration of the six-

tieth year of Queen Victoria's reign, the Irish Nationalist members have issued a manifesto recognizing the propriety for Great Britain of "this jubilation over the development of the principles of self-government, over that establishment of institutions broad-based upon the people's will, over that growth in numbers, comfort, strength, prosperity, and wealth, over that progress in manufactures, trade, and commerce which have marked this era in Britain and the colonies," and contrasting with these the continued government of Ireland "not according to, but against, her people's will; under a centralized and autocratic system, evil always, but growing more and more intolerable as the bounds of freedom have been wider set elsewhere." This certainly expresses the general feeling in Ireland, whose story for the last sixty years has in the main been one of famine, eviction, disaffection, coercion, and a very marked refusal by Parliament in latter years to extend to Ireland those principles of self-government which are the pride and boast of Englishmen.

In spite of internal dissensions the Irish members of Parliament manage to stand with their faces to the enemy, though with their backs to each other; and in my opinion the honest differences among them are more wholesome than absolute unity under a dictator, or submission to a clique. Want of unity, however, offers an opportunity to the Government to play off one set against another, and enables it to adhere to the old principle of *divide et impera*. The proposed grant to the landlords which is to accompany the local-government bill of next session will probably buy off their opposition to the extension of the local franchise. The grant will be equivalent to a capital sum of at least ten millions sterling, which the masses will have to pay to secure a right granted to every English citizen without charge. An attempt will doubtless be made to limit the franchise, to put checks on its exercise that will still enable the minority to rule. The majority of the Irish members who follow John Dillon's leadership have received Balfour's proposal with reserve, abstaining from expressing approval till the details of the scheme are put on paper; Timothy Healy, on the other hand, favors its acceptance frankly, on the assumption that it is honestly intended to be a measure of equality and similarity with the rest of Great Britain. He recommends that it shall be brought in first in the House of Lords, to avoid the labor, friction, and waste of time in passing a difficult measure through the Commons, to be rejected, mutilated, or transformed when it gets to the Lords.

Useful discussion of this promised reform is now impossible, for it is most unlikely that any of its details will be made known until the bill is produced next session. Even with the extended franchise in England the Radicals are far from satisfied; the complications of the system of registration of voters keep many citizens off the rolls. Voting qualifications can still be manufactured. One franchise for all elections, "one man and one vote," is what radical reformers aim at.

AN IRISHMAN.

AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION.

SYDNEY, May 10, 1897.

Australia is at present passing through an historical period, or a period which may be-

come one of supreme interest in its history. We are attempting to raise ourselves from a congeries of small States, all fighting against one another, to the status of a nation, with one central government and one common aim. Federation has been a dream of some of our statesmen for many years past, almost since the 50s, when we first attained to the dignity of governing ourselves under constitutions granted by the British Parliament. But it was only some eight or ten years ago that these dreams took any practical form, when the late Sir Henry Parkes, one of the foremost of our public men and the Premier at that time of New South Wales, instituted a movement for giving effect to the proposal. A preliminary conference of leading politicians from the various colonies was held in Melbourne in 1889, and as a result a convention of delegates from each colony, elected by the respective parliaments, took place in Sydney in 1891. At this convention—which was undoubtedly the finest intellectual combination ever got together in Australasia, and included many men since dead or who have dropped out of public life—a draft bill was prepared for submission to the various parliaments, putting forward a form of constitution to provide for federal union. This draft bill was a splendid piece of legislative work, and embodied in the main a sound scheme of federation; but somehow, no one quite knows how, it was never accepted seriously by the various parliaments, and, though never rejected by any, it was never passed. The ostensible reason given for this attitude was that the bill was not acceptable, having been drafted by delegates not directly elected by the people, but the real reason was that in some of the colonies local politics absorbed all attention for the time, and thus practically federation was shelved.

In the early part of last year a new turn was given to the federal wheel by the fact that a new set of ministers had, in the main, taken office in the various colonies, and some, at least, desired to bring the question of federation again to the front. A conference of premiers was held, and a draft enabling-bill agreed upon between them for submission to the various parliaments, authorizing the election by the people of each colony of ten delegates, who should meet in convention and draft a new form of constitution bill. This measure, it was provided, should, when agreed upon, be submitted to the various parliaments for revision, and the amendments here made were to be again considered by the convention. The draft, as finally adopted by the convention, was then to be submitted to a plebiscite of the whole of the people, for acceptance or rejection, and if accepted to be sent forward for the royal assent. Under this scheme there could be no doubt as to the voice of the people being heard, and there could be no complaint that the people had no choice in the matter.

The danger felt was, that in a convention of delegates elected upon a one-man-one-vote basis, as proposed, many of the best men might be excluded, and their places taken by frothy windbags. But in the main this prediction was not verified. Even in the most democratic colonies the people seem to have realized the importance of the occasion, and the delegates were, with possibly half-a-dozen exceptions, the very best men in our public life, and the conservative or

safe element greatly predominated. But the convention was not as fully representative as was hoped. New Zealand, which is situated 1,200 miles from the mainland of Australia, did not take part in the movement from the outset, and this left only the five continental colonies of Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia, and the island colony of Tasmania. Four of these, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania, passed the bill and duly elected delegates, but, for some reason, not quite clear, Queensland stood out altogether, and Western Australia at first followed suit. At the last moment, however, the Parliament of Western Australia hurriedly met, and itself elected ten delegates to represent the colony, who arrived after the convention sittings had opened and left before their close.

The convention, which met at the end of March, and closed its first session after just a month's work, thus consisted of fifty delegates, representing five colonies. The meeting-place was Adelaide, the capital city of South Australia, a town of some 140,000 inhabitants. To follow the work of the convention, it must be borne in mind that the great mass of the population is centred in two colonies, New South Wales and Victoria, the former of which has about 1,300,000 and the latter about 1,200,000 people, while, of the others represented, South Australia has about 360,000 inhabitants; Tasmania, 160,000; and Western Australia, 130,000. It will thus be seen that either of the two larger colonies has in itself a population almost double that of the three smaller colonies combined, and even had Queensland, with its population of 470,000, adhered, the larger colonies would still have been in the ascendant. This fact exercised a powerful influence on the whole deliberations of the convention, and though the debates were of a very high order, and the oratory very fine, the struggles between the delegates from the larger and smaller colonies were decidedly keen. But, in the end, compromise and good sense prevailed, and though at one time it appeared that the whole thing would fall to the ground, a scheme was evolved which, with some slight alterations, may be accepted by all the colonies. It was but natural that the experience of other federations should guide the delegates in their work, and of course your own system was largely drawn upon for precedents. Indeed, it may be said that, of all existing federations, that of the United States, the oldest, was generally conceded to have the most stable elements, and was, where applicable, the most largely followed.

Speaking generally of the scheme proposed, it may be stated that it was decided to name the federation the Commonwealth of Australia, that it should be a federation under the Crown, with a Governor-General nominated by the Queen, and that its legislature should consist of two houses—the Senate, representing the States as such, and the House of Representatives, representing the people of the States. In our nomenclature we are following you to this extent. The great struggles of the convention arose over the constitution and powers of the Senate. Some of the delegates from the larger colonies wished to have the members chosen upon a population basis, but those from the smaller States were unanimous in stating that if this principle was adopted, and unless equal representation for

each State was granted, they would not come in, and federation would thus be impossible. So the latter gained the day, and it was decided that each State should have six Senators, three of whom should retire every three years. In this decision the Constitution of the United States again afforded a partial precedent, and the fame of its Senate was largely quoted in favor of the equal representation system. But in the method of electing Senators a departure was made from your scheme, and it was decided that they be elected by the people direct in one constituency of the whole colony. The conservative element opposed this principle, but, after the results of the late convention elections, where the same principle was adopted, there is not so much reason to fear the results. The House of Representatives will be elected on a population basis, but there shall be as nearly as possible two members of this House to every one in the Senate, and it is expected that this basis will give about one member to every 50,000 inhabitants. The voting for both houses will be under manhood suffrage, with only one vote for each elector.

The great fight arose over the respective powers of the two houses. These necessarily differ greatly from your own. It was decided at the outset that our present system of responsible government should, as far as possible, be adopted, under which ministers would be nominated by the Governor-General, and be responsible to the House of Representatives, and, as at present, be able to appeal to the electors in the event of not possessing a majority in that chamber. The delegates from the larger colonies contended that, being the responsible chamber, the House of Representatives should have the dominating influence with respect to taxation and appropriation bills, but that on other matters both houses should have co-ordinate powers. The delegates from the smaller colonies as strongly protested that the Senate should be the powerful dominating chamber, and, as they were in a numerical majority, it was believed they would succeed, which would probably have meant the loss of federation, as the large colonies would not agree to accept these conditions. But eventually a compromise was arrived at. It was agreed that while upon all other subjects than finance the houses should have equal powers, the House of Representatives should initiate all money and taxation bills, and the Senate should have the power of rejecting these or first suggesting amendments in them, but not of making amendments. With this the matter was settled and a lion in the path removed.

The powers of the federal Parliament will be very full. It alone will deal with customs and excise taxation, defence, postal and telegraph matters, navigation, and all matters affecting relations with outside peoples, marriage and divorce, etc. It will not have power at the outset to take over the State debts or the railways, and, indeed, this matter of finance is one of the difficulties which do not appear to have been fully solved by the convention. But probably a suitable scheme will be evolved before the question is finally submitted to the people. One of the most important decisions of the convention was that to establish a final federal court of appeal, and do away with the right of appeal to the British Privy Council. In this matter a step is proposed upon which there is much

diversity of opinion, and it is possible the convention's proposal may not be accepted.

It has not been possible in the space at disposal to give more than a brief outline of the provisions of the measure, but the salient features have been sketched, and to Americans, with their experience of federal institutions, the significance of these will be more apparent, perhaps, than even to the majority of Australians. The bill put forward by the convention will be considered almost immediately by the various local parliaments, and the convention will sit again in Sydney in September, to put the last touches to it before it is submitted for the final decision of the people. What that decision may be it is difficult yet to say, but there is strong hope for believing that, as a result, we may enter into a federal union which may raise us to the status of a nation, and enable us to take a higher place in the affairs of the world. M. S.

MORLEY ON MACHIAVELLI.

OXFORD, June 4, 1897.

Mr. John Morley, as the Romanes lecturer of this year, delivered on Wednesday last, before a crowded audience in the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford, a very remarkable discourse upon Machiavelli. His lecture opened with a skilful and broadly outlined account of the atmosphere of excessive blame and exaggerated praise in which the memory of the great Florentine publicist and diplomatist has survived up to the present day. At the close he reinforced his introductory remarks by bringing them to bear upon a brilliant and studiously restrained account of the living problems in statecraft raised and brought home to the statesmen of to-day by a thoughtful and impartial consideration of Machiavelli's various dicta. This peroration, remarkable for the dexterity with which the lecturer avoided anything like definite allusions to current events or to the actual policy of England in the concert of Europe, was immediately preceded by a vivid picture of the career of Cæsar Borgia, while the exordium was followed by a personal sketch of Machiavelli, noticeable less for striking originality of detail than for wonderful fair-mindedness of view and a practised mastery in the arrangement and combination of topics. The great merit of this academic utterance was not primarily a scholarly one, unimpeachable though its scholarship was. The lecturer, by studiously fixing the thoughts of his audience, whom he carried with him throughout, and by carefully avoiding all direct reference to contemporary events, left them in a state of perplexity at the end, and forced them to deal with the present situation without his direct aid. And yet the drift of his carefully considered and powerfully phrased general considerations cannot but sweep those who deal frankly with their own thoughts into a mood of national self-scrutiny and criticism which will bear the fruits of moderation, and do much to check the tide of careless complacency to which the upholders of the pro-Turkish *status quo* in the East are for the moment especially inclined. Not by accident came the first note in Mr. Morley's exordium. It was Dante's eloquent arraignment of worldly fame, "Il mondan romore," which burst from his lips when he was traversing the first ledge of

the Mountain of Purgatory, where those who had sinned through pride were doing penance. The lecturer's quotation was from the end of the eleventh canto, but it implied to those familiar with Dante the beautiful opening lines, which are an inspired paraphrase of the Lord's prayer. Thus we may say with a certain ideal truth that the lecture opened with a prayer for deliverance from worldly pride. "From every quarter, and all the points of the historical compass," said the lecturer, "the veering gusts of public judgment have carried incessantly along, from country to country and from generation to generation, with countless mutations of aspect and of innuendo, the sinister renown of Machiavelli." Before he had been dead fifty years, the author of the 'Prince' had begun to haunt men's minds in all the great countries of the West "like some unholy necromancer, bewildering reason and conscience by riddles and paradox"; and thirty years after his death his works were on the Index at Rome, where, up to that time, his writings had met with toleration if not with approval. Upon him was concentrated a full measure of that unmeasured vituperation of the sixteenth century which has never been surpassed, and men "reproached, confuted, and cursed, but never read." The foes of every ecclesiastical faction in turn were branded as Machiavellists. "In England Royalists called him an atheist, and Roundheads called him a Jesuit, while Hudibras found in his Christian name the origin of our domestic title for the devil." He was pilloried with Averroes and denounced with Tacitus. More recently the disappearance of the temporal power, unification in Italy and Germany, revolutions in France, and the realization of the idea of the armed people—Machiavelli's idea—have led to an equally extravagant over-appreciation. Bacon hailed in "Machiavel" one who wrote "what men do, not what they ought to do." Hobbes had many points in common with him, and Harrington studied him more faithfully than any other Englishman, while Hume criticised his general statements in politics as premature because made before the world had as yet had political experience of three thousand years. Nor was Montesquieu, though in most respects to be contrasted with Machiavelli, at all neglectful of him. At this point the lecturer's preliminary survey, which occupied nearly a quarter of the whole discourse, closed with a quotation from Tréveret, who said, "Montesquieu's book is a study, Machiavelli's is a political act, an attempt at political resurrection."

From this point the lecturer devoted himself during the space of rather more than half an hour to a consideration of Machiavelli's life, of his style and his method, as well as of the materials which he used. This whole discussion was rounded out with the life of Cæsar Borgia, a brief and effective sketch belonging equally to the concrete account of Machiavelli which preceded it, and to the considerations of universal political expediency with which the lecture closed. Throughout this part of Mr. Morley's address the clearness and effectiveness of his argument depended upon a reading which is, as all the world knows, very broad.

Neither English, Italian, nor German critics and authorities have been neglected; but still the prevailing note, giving lucidity and lending lightness, came to him from his ex-

ceptional familiarity with French writers, and the final impression was what we should have expected from the author of well-known and justly celebrated accounts of Rousseau and Voltaire. Mr. Morley's crisp and clear recital of the facts in Machiavelli's life centred in a quotation from his letter to Francesco Vettori, a description given by Machiavelli in 1513 of his life on the farm where he endeavored to console himself for political disgrace "nelle antiche conti degli antichi uomini." Symonds's translation of this letter, used by the lecturer, is also an abridgment, but, apart from the omission of certain shades of local color, Symonds is faithful, and the use made of it just at this point is admirable. A fuller citation would, however, have enforced more completely the lecturer's remark that "Machiavelli was not meant either by temperament or principle to be a willing martyr," and would have given additional point to his fine contrast between Machiavelli's mood and "the stern virtue of Dante." Exceedingly discriminating was Mr. Morley's not too admiring account of Machiavelli's comic vein, in giving reins to which he repaid Fortune "with her own banter," as well as the characterization he gave of his author's 'Art of War,' written "to induce his countrymen to substitute for mercenary armies a national militia." Turning from the author's life to his mind, Mr. Morley strikingly portrayed the narrow range of Machiavelli's reading, and eloquently showed what might have been learned from "that first great chapter in European literature, still, indeed, the greatest of its kind, of reflections on a revolution," if Machiavelli had read Thucydides. Then followed a contrast and a parallel between the Italy of Machiavelli's day and the Hellas of the Peloponnesian war, focussed finally in what was not so much a description as a moving apostrophe to Michael Angelo's figures of Twilight and Dawn, Night and Day.

But it was Machiavelli's method that Mr. Morley pronounced to be his "merit in the history of political literature." In spite of an uncritical simplicity which belonged to the mind of his day, Machiavelli "withdrew politics from scholasticism, and based their consideration upon observation and experience." Though full of palpable contradictions, his work was more systematic than that of Retz or Comynes, though less so than that of Hobbes. "Human things," Mr. Morley went on to say, "have many sides and many aspects, and an observant man of the world does not confine himself to one way of looking at them from fear of being thought inconsistent." De Sanctis qualifies Machiavelli's prose as "divine," and perhaps we should not differ from him, said the lecturer, adding, however, the pertinent question, "Only, what word is then left for the really great writers who to intellectual strength add moral grandeur?" and then he quoted Napoleon's standard of generalship—his demand that a general should indulge in no mental pictures, but look at the thing clearly as through a field-glass.

"Machiavelli's is the style of the field-glass," said Mr. Morley. "He has the highest of all the virtues that prose writing can possess—save the half-dozen cases in literature of genius with unconquerable wings: he is simple, unaffected, direct, vivid, and rational. . . . He uses few of our loud, easy words of praise or blame, he is not often sorry or glad, he does not smile and he does not scold, he is seldom indignant and he is never surprised. He has not even

the mastering human infirmity of trying to persuade. His business is that of the clinical lecturer, explaining the nature of the malady, the proper treatment, and the chances of recovery. He strips away the flowing garments of convention and commonplace."

Just here Mr. Morley put in his caveat, striking the clear note of hope and progress which he misses in the great Florentine's faith and ideal. "Commonplace, after all," said he, "is exactly what contains the truths that are indispensable," and, amid all "the confused clamor against Machiavelli, people knew what they meant, and their instinct was not unsound. Mankind, and well they know it, are far too profoundly concerned in right and wrong, in mercy and cruelty, in justice and oppression, to favor a teacher who, even for a scientific purpose of his own, forgets the awful difference." These points were then reinforced by apt quotations from Machiavelli's works, and, for the sake of scrupulous fairness, much was made of the closing chapter of the 'Prince,' and of the Florentine's arguments against a military dictator, as well as of his declaration that the ruler, whether hereditary or a usurper, can have no safety unless he founds himself on popular favor and goodwill. Finally, Mr. Morley pointed out the great flaw in Machiavelli's ideal, namely, that he did not look to the future but to the past, and sought to revive the free Roman commonwealth. He also made it clear that something more hopeful and progressive must command our adhesion than the faith of Machiavelli in the changeless persistence of human nature, in the faults and frailties which he pitilessly discovered in his own time, echoing (without knowing them) the despairing comments of Thucydides upon the factions of Greece in the days of Nicias and Alcibiades. At the same time, Mr. Morley showed that his author had nothing to do with "that most brilliant and illustrious of living German scholars" who "idolizes Julius Cæsar, dispatches Cato as a pedant and Cicero as a coxcomb." Finally he pointed out that Mommsen's account of Sulla offers a profound and concrete commentary upon Machiavelli's 'Prince,' and then gave one far more telling in Cæsar Borgia, put forward by Machiavelli himself "as a model for such as climb to power by good fortune and the help of others."

Turning at the last to the problems which Machiavelli raises, Mr. Morley observed that in one sense we are shocked by his maxims "in proportion to our ignorance of history," and urged that we should do well to take care lest in blaming Machiavelli for openly prescribing hypocrisy, we "slip unperceived into something like hypocrisy of our own." There have been only two perfect princes in the world. "If you add to princes," he here interjected, not a little to the amusement of the house, "presidents and prime ministers, the percentage might still be low." Then followed a discursive account of the various forms of insincerity and hypocrisy to which highly famed rulers in various lands have had recourse, with only the plea of "reasons of state" to give them color of justification. At this point came the searching questions whether the State was means or end. How far does citizenship dominate all other relations and duties? What are we to think of D'Alembert's motto for a virtuous man: "I prefer my family to myself, my country to my family, and humanity to my country"? Then the

lecturer detailed marks of progress, such as the mitigation of the usages of war, the fact that "diplomacy, though it is said even now not to be wholly purged of lying, fraud, and duplicity, still is conscious of having a character to keep up for truth and plain dealing, so far as circumstances allow." It is interesting to note that the audience accepted this tribute, and made for themselves a certain practical application of it to recent events. This led them to break into a hilarity which, though by no means extreme, was still significant. Mr. Morley commented further upon the recognition of duty towards inferior races marked by the Berlin and Brussels Conferences, and insisted, with historical facts to prove the point, that "all these improvements in the character of nations were in the minds of the best men in Machiavelli's day." Therefore he concluded that, in the great cycles of human change, Machiavelli can have no place among the strong thinkers and orators and writers who have elevated the conception of the State, and humanized the methods and maxims of government, and raised citizenship "to be a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection." Indeed, Machiavelli's idea of reconstructing a society "that had once been saturated with the great ruling conceptions of the thirteenth century, by trying to awaken the social energy of ancient Rome," was characterized by the lecturer as quite "as much of an anachronism as Julian the Apostate." We may venture to add that, if Machiavelli had here again been able to look far enough back, he would have found in many places, say in the fifth book of Plato's laws, that very ideal of citizenship which Mr. Morley desiderates.

Here again the lack of breadth in culture which made Thucydides a closed book to the Florentine writer, is conspicuous in his defects. But even with the restricted outlook of Machiavelli's day, it was possible for a man to realize the importance of those "living forces by which societies subsist and governments are strong," which Machiavelli set aside as irrelevant. And here, at the very close of his lecture, Mr. John Morley evoked, as a companion figure to set over against Cæsar Borgia, John Calvin and the republic of Geneva, champions, and victorious ones, of the triumph of moral force. This was done the more effectively because there was no attempt to disguise the readiness of Calvin to resort to carnal weapons, no apology for his vindictiveness in persecution. The sixteenth century in Italy, with all its resemblance to the eighteenth century in France, yet lacked, said the lecturer, what was characteristic of the latter, "belief in the better elements of mankind." Was this belief a worse illusion, he asked, than Machiavelli's dream that he could build on a foundation of "cunning, jealousy, perfidy, ingratitude, duplicity"—the only qualities he recognized in human society?

"It is true to say," so began the closing period of the lecture, "that Machiavelli represents certain living forces in our actual world; that science, with its survival of the fittest, unconsciously lends him illegitimate aid; that, in Lord Acton's words, 'he is not a vanishing type, but a constant and contemporary influence.' This is because energy, force, will, violence, skill, keep alive in the world their resistance to the control of justice and conscience, humanity and right. In so far as he represents one side in that eternal struggle, and suggests one set of considerations about it, he retains a place

in the literature of modern political systems and of European morals."

LOUIS DYER.

Correspondence.

LONDON DAILIES IN BOSTON LIBRARIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your comment upon the 'List of Periodicals, Newspapers, Transactions, etc.,' published by the Boston Public Library, you have, not through your own fault, fallen into error regarding the symbols used to designate the various institutions represented in this list. You have been led to suppose that the Boston Athenæum alone takes currently the *London Times* and the *Daily News*, whereas these and four other London dailies are taken at the Public Library. "News. Room" is an abbreviation for the newspaper room of the institution, but it was neglect not to have said so.

It is of interest to add that this list was printed and bound under the roof of the Boston Public Library, and that the material was also all put into type by the use of the linotype machine. This would not now be so remarkable, except for the fact that in setting up titles in such a variety of languages, a large number of unusual accents and other "sorts" were necessary. The machine fonts now in use by this library comprise over five hundred distinct characters, and enable it to undertake the printing of almost any catalogue, with the added advantage of mechanical swiftness.

I may say, in answer to your wish that some information had been furnished in regard to the condition of files of periodicals, that this desirable feature was omitted for the sake of economy of space, and from the fear lest confusion should arise from an over-widening of titles. Some day there ought to be a full list of serial literature, past as well as present, with full bibliographical and literary data. Possibly the present achievement will stimulate some one to the greater task.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY SWIFT.

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON,
June 9, 1897.

Notes.

Macmillan Co. have in preparation a 'Dictionary of Architecture,' to be published in three large octavo volumes, under the direction of Russell Sturgis, author of 'European Architecture: An Historical Study.' The work will include special articles by many of the leading architects, sculptors, engineers; mural painters, and other men having practical knowledge of the arts about which they write. Biography is part of the scheme; and one may expect to find definitions of terms, history and criticism of styles, together with some account of building as an art, materials and their employment, construction (practical and scientific), modern appliances to meet novel requirements, modern and ancient practice in the application of painting and sculpture to buildings, landscape gardening in connection with architecture, etc., etc. The volumes will be abundantly illustrated.

The same firm announce for early publi-

cation an edition, in six volumes (a book to each), of Spenser's 'Faerie Queene,' edited with introduction and glossary by K. M. Warren; and 'The Observations of a Foster Parent,' in respect to many problems of education.

Joseph Henry Allen's addresses and essays, bound together under the title 'Sequel to "Our Liberal Movement,"' will be published by Roberts Brothers.

D. Appleton & Co. will very shortly bring out 'The Private Life of the Queen,' by a member of the royal household; 'Peter the Great,' by K. Waliszewski, author of the 'Romance of an Empress, Catharine II. of Russia'; a new historical novel by Conan Doyle, 'Uncle Bernac'; 'His Majesty's Greatest Subject,' by S. S. Thorburn; and 'Equality,' by Edward Bellamy.

The Century Company will have ready in the autumn a patriotic itinerary, 'The Century Book of the American Revolution,' by Elbridge S. Brooks.

Flood & Vincent, Meadville, announce among their Chautauqua text-books 'Imperial Germany,' by Sidney Whitman; 'Roman Life in Pliny's Time,' from the French of Maurice Pellissier, by Miss Maud Wilkinson; and 'The Social Spirit in America,' by Prof. C. R. Henderson of the University of Chicago.

L. C. Page & Co., Boston, conclude this month their library edition, in fourteen volumes, of Catharine Charlotte Lady Jackson's works, with 'The Court of the Tuileries' in two volumes.

Ginn & Co., Boston, are preparing to publish during the present month the *Zoological Bulletin*, a companion serial to the *Journal of Morphology*, but with no illustrations beyond text-figures, and with no bibliographical lists. The editors are C. O. Whitman and W. M. Wheeler. Each volume will contain six numbers.

'The Chatelaine,' experiences of travel, by G. E. X., will be published by the Peter Paul Book Co., Buffalo.

Stone & Kimball will have ready early in September the second issue of Edwin Emerson, Jr.'s, 'College Year-Book and Athletic Record,' greatly improved.

'The Story of the Union Jack,' told by Barlow Cumberland for the Jubilee year, will bear the imprint of William Briggs, Toronto.

The great protectionist reaction through which we are now passing has apparently prompted the Henry Clay Publishing Company of this city to start into being on a capital of the plates of the Rev. Calvin Colton's Life, Correspondence and Speeches of Clay in three, one, and two volumes respectively. These have been reprinted and bound uniformly, and embellished with numerous portraits of Clay himself and of other public characters, his contemporaries. Moreover, the publishers have procured of Speaker Reed a not lengthy introduction to the reprint, followed by a very unworkmanlike bibliography, for which the Speaker seems to claim, if not authorship, at least a modest responsibility. This matter is placed at the front of volume I. A thin seventh volume has been wholly composed by Mr. McKinley (whose preface just antedates his nomination last year), and purports to be a history of tariff legislation from 1812 to 1896. We must for the present leave our readers to enjoy for themselves these additions to the original series. They can profitably engage also in a comparison of the protection idea

as enunciated by Clay with that which now haunts the brain of Dingley and Aldrich. At our leisure we may return to the subject.

The latest scholarly edition of Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' proceeds with a becoming slowness. We now have volume three (London: Methuen & Co.; New York: Macmillan). Prof. Bury's additions to the author's footnotes are again supplemented in an appendix in which there are many learned discussions of great interest. Such are those concerning the Picts and Scots, the origin of the Huns, the libraries of Alexandria, Alaric in Greece and in Italy (first invasion), and the Procopian legends. With the help of Prof. Dowden, an allusion to Voltaire—as "a poet far superior to Claudian"—is first explained; its interjection by Gibbon makes it all the more curious.

The sixth volume of the "Outward Bound" edition of Kipling's Writings in prose and verse (Scribners) comprises seventeen of the shorter tales and dramas, in three groupings. The elder Kipling's regulation three illustrations in relief are of very even merit, and the first, "Wee Willie Winkie," has much the charm of a carving in ivory.

The bound volume of the *Century* for the six months ending in April last contains nothing more certain to be reread, perhaps, than Gen. Porter's "Campaigning with General Grant." We might except Capt. Mahan's foretastes of his *Life of Nelson*, three papers on as many famous engagements; and Dr. Weir Mitchell's "Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker," the leading serial, may be counted on to find readers in book form. Of transient yet of no slight interest is the "symposium" on the reasons for the failure of the Confederacy; and to ponder once more Mr. Buel's "Our Fellow-Citizen of the White House," a plain account of the cares assumed by a conscientious and independent executive like Mr. Cleveland, will be salutary occupation for anybody. Washington, both by reason of the change of administration and of the completion of the National Library building, cuts a considerable figure in this volume.

A like revolution of time (December-May) brings us the sixth volume of Mr. Charles F. Lummis's 'Land of Sunshine' (Los Angeles), with its customary store of camera illustration, and with the beginning of the editor's scholarly translation, with facsimile, of the 'Reglamento para el Gobierno de la Provincia de Californias' (Mexico, 1784). Nature in such views as those of the palms of San Fernando or the sycamore and mistletoe, the Wonderful Rock of Katzimo (surpassing any Old World acropolis), or the eroded, pinnacles called the Navajo Church, the falls in Cataract Cañon, Arizona, together with old Spanish monuments, "Camulos Rancho" (associated with Helen Hunt Jackson's 'Ramona'), views of Pacific Coast industries and fêtes, of native and foreign population—all this makes a forcible appeal to the curiosity of the untraveller. The contributed articles offer a very varied interest, and the editorial pages are racy and plain-spoken as heretofore.

The *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* for June possesses no salient feature. The anonymous review of Mahan's 'Nelson' and the brief paper on the Röntgen rays, both among the leading articles, might seem alien to the scope of the magazine; but Capt. Mahan bears an honorary degree from Harvard, and Prof. Trowbridge intimates in a very interesting way what direction the Jefferson

Physical Laboratory is giving to the development of Röntgen's discovery. There are pleas for a greater endowment of the Medical School in view of the numerical proportion of its students in the university total, and for contentment with the persistent smallness of the Divinity School pending a recognition of its aims and its unique position among theological institutions. Mr. Noble's article on "The Choice of Overseers" proves a marked conservatism on the part of the youngest graduates who have a hand in nominating or electing the members of that body. Reëlection seems almost a prescriptive right if desired. Dr. William James's short address on Agassiz will be succeeded in the next number by his fine performance at the Shaw memorial exercises in Boston last month. The house of John Harvard's mother at Stratford and a portrait of Mr. R. C. Lehmann, the new Oxford boating coach, are the illustrations of the magazine.

In the April number of *Art et Décoration* (Boston: *American Architect*) will be found photographic memoranda of Jean-Paul Laurens's huge "decorative panel" in the Champs-Élysées, "Le Lauragais," commented on last week in our Paris letter on the Salons. It must be thought to suffer much in this reproduction; and the weak rather than the strong points of Aman-Jean's triptych are likewise emphasized in a smaller copy. There are some capital bits of furniture design in this number; nothing more charming than the child's chair of M. Dampy on p. 74.

Better executed samples of the Salon are to be had in the *Figaro-Salon* now beginning to come to us from Boussod, Valadon & Cie., No. 303 Fifth Avenue, with the customary loose large colored plate in addition to those bound up with the text. M. Debat-Ponson's "Le Sillon" offers a poetic criticism on J. P. Laurens's analogous theme.

Parts 11 and 12 of Paul Langhans's 'Deutscher Kolonial-Atlas' (Gotha: Perthes; New York: Lemcke & Buechner) exhibit German colonization eastward from the mother country (1) in the Danube region; the Togo and Cameroon protectorates (three last of the four sheets); and, in an entire map of Africa, Germany's civilizing efforts (*Kulturbestrebungen*) on that continent, with a side-map showing her exploratory share in the solution of the Nile problem. These charts are all skillfully colored for statistical and other purposes.

From the same source comes to us the twelfth edition of 'Berghaus's Chart of the World,' on Mercator's projection, the standard exhibit of trade routes by land and sea, ocean currents and wind zones, drift-ice, continental railroad and telegraph systems, etc. The trader and navigator being first in mind, the Chart is edited in English. Some of the novelties are the modifications of the arctic map in consequence of Jackson's exploration of Franz-Josef Land, Nansen's voyage in the *Fram*, and the Russian surveys of the Ob and Yenisei deltas; the course and progress of the Trans-Siberian Railway. Politically, too, the Chart is up-to-date, as appears from the provincial subdivisions of Canada, the map of Africa, etc. The four oblong sheets are capable of being mounted.

Beginning with the present year, the Archaeological Institute of America will publish uniformly and regularly its papers, reports, and other documents, converting to its use the existing *American Journal of Ar-*

chæology, and styling it "second series." It will be conducted by an editorial board representing the Institute and the Schools of Classical Studies at Athens and at Rome. It will be issued six times a year by Macmillan Co., and the bi-monthly parts will be sold separately, as will reprints of important papers. Prof. John H. Wright of Harvard will be editor-in-chief for 1897.

The American School of Classical Studies in Rome will open, for its third year, on October 15, 1897, under the direction of Prof. Clement L. Smith of Harvard, and with Mr. Richard Norton of Bryn Mawr for Professor of Archæology. Pursuit of the course on palæography will secure the privilege of studying MSS. in the Vatican and other libraries. There will also be courses in epigraphy, numismatics, the catacombs, and Pompeii. The school year will close August 15, 1898, with opportunity for study, for limited periods, in other parts of Italy and in Greece. The school building is on the corner of the Via Gaeta and Via Palestro. There is no tuition fee. Further particulars must be sought of Prof. Smith (at Cambridge, Mass., till August 1, and, after that date, care of Sebesti & Reali, Rome), or of Prof. W. G. Hale, chairman of the managing committee, University of Chicago.

—The eighth volume of Mr. Paul Leicester Ford's edition of Jefferson's Writings (Putnam's) embraces the whole of his first Presidential term, and leaves him, in the first year of the second, confronted with Burr's conspiracy. This situation was hardly more trying than that which he had to face on succeeding John Adams, under the profound irritation caused by that President's clapping into office as many of his fellow-partisans as possible on the very eve of going out himself. Nothing is more striking than the close resemblance between Jefferson's position about removals and that assumed afterwards by Mr. Cleveland as to the display of offensive partisanship by Federal office-holders, the theory of "due participation (or proportion) of office" or "equilibrium in office" in view of an existing monopoly by the party last in power, etc. Jefferson cherished in his mind a proposal to enjoin executive officers from intermeddling with elections. He thought he could set himself right before his opponents by maintaining "the justice of making vacancies in order to introduce a participation of office," but he found them suspicious of his motives, and prompt to meet his numerical statistics with comparisons of the pecuniary worth of the offices held by perhaps a minority of Republicans and those held by a majority of Federalists. Like Cleveland, he made the mistake not of expelling indecent partisans, but of admitting new men to take their places as partisans. He held, at least as a matter of convenience in the case of Callender, that public offices were not confided to him to give away as charities; yet in the case of John Page, as Mr. Ford shows at length, he endeavored to provide this friend with sinecure offices which might become hereditary in the family. This undemocratic procedure was in progress when the great head of the unterrified Democracy was counselling Charles Wilson Peale, about to exhibit his mammoth abroad, not to jumble his audiences together—"the decent part of them" with "pickpockets, chimney-sweeps, etc.," but to "set three different divisions of the day at three different prices," for the beau monde,

merchants and respectable citizens, and "the lower description."

—As a sequel to the Virginia insurrection of 1800, there is a good deal in this volume concerning schemes of colonizing the blacks, in the West Indies or in Sierra Leone rather than within the limits of the United States. In 1805 Jefferson writes that he had long since given up expectation of any early provision for extinguishing slavery, and believed that nothing short of a general slave uprising would spur the country to such a step. In his first message to Congress he took the position, in which he had Gallatin's hearty approval, that "sound principles will not justify our taxing the industry of our fellow-citizens to accumulate treasure for wars to happen we know not when, and which might not, perhaps, happen but from the temptations offered by that treasure." Like Darwin, Jefferson lost his relish for poetry as he grew older, but he records the fact in language amazingly flowery. "The purists of New England" made him nervous as to the style of his first message, which he begs Madison to revise for him so as to observe strictness of grammar where it does not weaken expression. "But," he adds, "where by small grammatical negligences the energy of an idea is condensed, or a word stands for a sentence, I hold grammatical rigor in contempt." This has not prevented Jefferson from being quoted more frequently in the Oxford Dictionary than, we believe, any one if not all of his critics. We remark, finally, that there is a suggestion of Montaigne in the confession (respecting speculations concerning a future life), "I have for many years . . . reposed my head on that pillow of ignorance which a benevolent Creator has made so soft for us, knowing how much we should be forced to use it."

—An address delivered November 27, 1895, by A. C. Goodell, jr., before the Massachusetts Society of Colonial Wars, "in commemoration of the six hundredth anniversary of the first summoning of citizens and burgesses to the Parliament of England," has been printed in a thin volume daintily bound in white and blue. Mr. Goodell's aim, as the sub-title of his address tells us, was to sketch the history of the House of Commons and compare the development of the legislatures of Great Britain and of Massachusetts. The two parts of the address do not hang together very well, but such comparison as there is is quite to the advantage of Massachusetts. We cannot share, however, Mr. Goodell's view of the progress of representative government in England. It is, of course, easy to show that the House of Commons was not, until a late period, a truly representative body in the modern sense; where Mr. Goodell errs, we think, is in failing to see that the appearance of a new political theory, as in the case of the Parliaments of 1265 and 1295, was of itself a matter of great importance, in spite of the fact that the general application of the theory was long delayed. Nor can we endorse the author's rather extreme depreciation of the character and work of Simon de Montfort, or quite admit that the latter "remains a romantic myth in the dim past to tempt credulous lovers of the picturesque in history to use him as a glittering foil to the dreary, vacant background of the unknown." We note that Mr. Goodell speaks

of the document known as *De Tallagio non Concedendo* as a statute, although such is no longer the received opinion.

—There is not a more lucid and trustworthy writer on music in England than Mr. F. Corder, and his most valuable contribution to musical literature is 'The Orchestra and How to Write for It' (E. Schuberth & Co.). It condenses into 111 pages a vast amount of useful and often curious and striking information, very much of which cannot be found elsewhere. It differs from most other works on instrumentation and orchestration in being serviceable not only to those who have studied all the other branches of composition, but also to "the less gifted," who may, as the author remarks, "at one time or another, write a song, a valse, a march, an operetta, or a cantata, and have an opportunity of getting it performed by a more or less complete orchestra." And whereas other books on this subject treat only of full orchestra and small orchestra, Mr. Corder does not disdain to include in his consideration brass bands, theatre bands, and other of the humbler combinations of instruments. For the unskilled he has facilitated matters by giving in the examples the real notes of the transposing instruments. Another point in which Mr. Corder's treatise differs favorably from most of its predecessors is in the great catholicity of choice of examples, from the earliest times to the present day—from Bach to Grieg and Johann Strauss. The following lines from the pages on the viola give a good idea of Mr. Corder's treatment of his subject:

"It is of increasing importance in the present day to have the Violas numerous and good, as composers sometimes avail themselves of the gloomy and characteristic tone to give this instrument the top part. No one would do this throughout an entire work as Méhul did in his opera 'Uthal' (1803); but Wagner has frequently done it for an entire scene ('Tristan,' act ii., sc. 2, 'Walküre,' act i., sc. 3, etc.), and Brahms has written a serenade for orchestra (op. 16 in A) with Violas in place of Violins. For a few bars the effect is far more pleasing than for longer. One of the few existing important solos for Viola is Berlioz's 'Harold in Italy' symphony, which has a Viola obligato all through; but the obligato to Annchen's song in the second act of Weber's 'Freischütz' is a far better specimen of how to write effectually for the instrument. To these actual solos I will add the quotation of a very beautiful one from Liszt, the opening of the slow movement of the 'Faust' symphony."

—The representation of musical sounds by numbers expressing the relative lengths of a given string or tube required to produce them has been, from antiquity, the delight of ingenious mathematicians. This interesting subject is once more treated of in a thesis entitled 'Musical Pitch and the Measurement of Intervals among the Ancient Greeks,' which was presented for the Doctorate in Philology in the Johns Hopkins University by Mr. Charles W. L. Johnson, and which deserves recognition for the ability and industry displayed in it. The first half of the pamphlet is taken up with an elaborate analysis of ancient definitions of "pitch" and "interval" which are superfluous even to the most exhaustive discussion of the subject announced, and are mainly, like most ancient definitions, unscientific, even for their own age, and of no practical value whatever in ours. But in an essay born and cradled in academic halls much must be allowed to the *genius*

loci, and especially this sort of conservation of learned texts. At any rate, in his discussion of these texts from Greek writers on music, the essayist has employed the only method of interpretation which offers any reasonable hope of clearing up certain perplexed points in ancient music—namely, that of ascertaining the meaning of certain words by tabulating all the passages where they occur in the same author, and in others of the same age and school. Such words as *tonos*, *tropos*, *eidos*, *chroa*, for example, need to be thus ascertained for every period of ancient musical science, and we believe that the unknown date of several of those writers could be approximately fixed by their use of certain of these words in one or another sense. The selection, for a doctor's thesis, of a subject so intricate and so laborious is a promising sign. The time is evidently at hand when we may expect occasionally to find in the thesis of an American student, as we already find in many German and French doctors' theses, valuable contributions to the knowledge of the subject discussed.

—Eleonora Duse's triumphant appearance at last on the Parisian stage, challenging (as here in New York) comparison with Sarah Bernhardt, has led Jules Claretie to write about her at some length in the *Temps*. She had, he says, attracted the attention of the younger Dumas by securing for his "Princess of Bagdad" a great success in Italy, whereas in Paris the play proved all but a failure. It does not appear certain that the playwright and the actress ever met, though they had corresponded with each other, and he often desired a French counterpart of her for his service. It was in the "Dame aux Camélias" that M. Claretie himself first saw Duse act, some four years ago, in London, when he had for his companion the great French actress, Mlle. Bartet. He relates his own immediate conquest by Duse, and then tells of the effect on Mlle. Bartet of Duse's simulation of being fatally stricken: "She is ill. They will have to interrupt the play, and I cannot attend to-morrow, for I must act myself. How unlucky!" The consummate art she was witnessing had deceived, or thrown off its guard, her professional sense of dramatic unreality; and, as M. Claretie observes, Duse, perhaps, never won a greater triumph.

AN AMERICAN EXPLORER IN EAST AFRICA.

Through Unknown African Countries: The First Expedition from Somaliland to Lake [Rudolf and] Lamu. By A. Donaldson Smith, M.D., F.R.G.S. Illustrated. Edward Arnold. 6 maps. 8vo, pp. xvi, 471.

The region between the Indian Ocean and the Nile is now the most interesting part of unexplored Africa. The coast districts are comparatively well known, but the interior has been traversed only here and there by a few expeditions, while an extensive tract still remains absolutely unknown. In this lies hidden the solution of some important geological and orographical problems, and, judging from the adjacent lands, it probably has an extraordinarily rich fauna and flora, containing species, especially of birds, unknown to science. The whole region is a sportsman's paradise, its plains being almost the last refuge of many characteristic African animals, while its human inhabitants

are of the most varied types, from the pigmy representative of the aboriginal race to the half-civilized Abyssinian. Though some of it is waterless desert, a large part is a fertile wilderness, so elevated as to be apparently fitted for white colonization, and its hills give evidence of great mineral wealth. It is interesting politically, also, as the possible battle-ground where, in the not distant future, England and Abyssinia may contend for possession.

The chief obstacle to its exploration is the hostility of the natives to all strangers. Inveterate raiders themselves of their neighbors, they naturally regard every man not of their own village or tribe as an enemy. Unfortunately, the conduct of some white sportsmen has intensified this feeling. If native accounts are to be credited, the expeditions of Prince Ruspoli and Capt. Bottego especially differed little from those of avowed raiders. These Italian adventurers attacked and plundered the people through whose territory they passed, leaving behind them a fierce hatred for all the white race. Mainly from this cause the route from the north and east through this region to Lake Rudolf was held three years ago to be impracticable for the ordinary traveller. The success of our countryman, Dr. Donaldson Smith, therefore, in traversing it with a comparatively small number of men is very notable, and gives him a high rank among African explorers.

Our satisfaction, however, it should be added, is somewhat lessened by the fact that he was obliged several times to resort to force. It is true that he only defended himself when attacked, that he paid for the camels and cattle which he seized, and that he invariably freed with rich presents the natives whom he captured. But it is difficult to see anything but an unjustifiable disregard of natural rights in his forcing his way against the will of the inhabitants. In a country where at certain seasons food and water are barely sufficient for the wants of the people living in it, the passage of a caravan of one hundred men and as many animals may prove an intolerable scourge, to be prevented, if possible. The mapping the course of a dozen rivers, the securing scores of specimens new to science, the traversing hundreds of miles of unknown country—does not outweigh the life of a single native sacrificed in defence of his herds and his wells. Whether Dr. Smith could have gained his end peacefully through the exercise of greater tact and patience we cannot say, but the experience of other travellers, especially of Thomson with the Masai, as fiercely hostile to whites certainly as the Boran and Arbore, leads us to believe in its possibility.

With this exception, then, we have nothing but praise for the courage, endurance of no ordinary hardships, and persistence against great obstacles which characterized Dr. Smith in the adventurous journey described in this interesting volume. With a costly expedition, organized and maintained at his own expense, he travelled some four thousand miles, much of it through wholly unexplored territory. A sportsman, he subordinated hunting to the interests of science, and, by his numerous and careful observations, has contributed materially to our knowledge of the geography of East Africa. Among his collections, to quote from Sir William Flower's remarks at a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, were six

thousand specimens of insects, four new species of fish, eleven of reptiles and batrachians; and out of more than seven hundred specimens of birds there were "found no less than twenty-four species which were previously unknown to science." Of very great anthropological interest, also, is the discovery of a tribe of dwarfs "farther north than they have hitherto been met with."

Our author left Berbera, on the Gulf of Aden, in July, 1894, with two white companions and eighty-two Somali, his goal being Lake Rudolf, some six hundred miles to the southwest. The strip of coast-land under British protection having been crossed, he entered immediately into a region subject to the raids of the Abyssinians. A village on the border, with "great herds of fine cattle," was attacked a few days after he passed, and the "cattle driven off, the young girls taken as slaves, and the older people killed and mutilated." In this way a large tract of fertile country is rapidly being turned into an uninhabited wilderness. The Abyssinians themselves were not encountered until a district, nearly half-way to the lake, was reached, which was permanently occupied by them. Here the expedition was detained by the commanding general until the assent of the Emperor Menelek to its further progress could be obtained. In an interesting account of this man and his followers, Dr. Smith speaks highly of their soldierly qualities, but says that their morals are far below those of their heathen neighbors.

A few miles from the Abyssinian camp, the river Web cuts a passage through a defile in such a way that "the whole mountain appeared to be resting on a series of columns thirty to forty feet high and twenty to eighty feet apart, between which were spacious vaulted chambers, with their domes rising many feet higher; and then again many columns uniting formed long arched tunnels." In one of these chambers the natives had apparently been accustomed to offer sacrifices. "There was an enormous fireplace on one side, over and about which were hung various offerings that had been made to Wak, consisting principally of wooden vessels, strings of cowry shells, sheepskins, and leather straps."

The necessary permission for his further progress having been refused by the Emperor, in a courteous letter of which an interesting facsimile reproduction is given, Dr. Smith turned reluctantly back towards the coast, taking a more southerly route than the one by which he came. As soon as he was beyond the Abyssinian "sphere of influence," a fresh, and this time successful, attempt was made to reach the lake. The chief difficulties encountered in this region arose from the scarcity of food and water and the very natural reluctance of the inhabitants to give or sell them to the expedition. This was generally overcome by gifts of trading-goods, but at times violent measures, such as the seizing of animals and men, were used. In repelling one of the inevitable attacks upon the expedition under these circumstances, Dr. Smith says, "The punishment the natives received was terrible." The loss of the expedition was one boy. In this instance the assailants were the Boran, a numerous and powerful race who resembled the Abyssinians in their light copper color, "their long faces, broad foreheads, and generally intelligent cast of features." An indication of an advance in

their condition is the fact that while formerly they were divided up into many different tribes, they were now united under one king. There are also traces of an ancient civilization in some of their wells. One in a meadow was "approached by a winding passage a hundred yards long, which descends gradually to the bottom of a large round chamber fifty feet deep and opening straight to the top. The passageway and the chamber itself have both been cut through solid rock. In the latter are a series of basins for receiving the water as it is drawn up from a narrow opening dug another forty feet below the bottom of the chamber."

Another still more interesting race was the Dume, living in the hitherto unexplored country to the north of Lake Stephanie. These were dwarfs about five feet in height, or five or six inches taller than the pigmies of the great equatorial forest. This and their black color seem to show their mixed origin. About a thousand in number, they raise sheep and goats, and occasionally kill elephants with poisoned arrows. From the meagre description of them by Dr. Smith, we gather that they do not differ materially in condition from the neighboring races. A considerable mental development, indeed, is evident from the fact that they can count to thirty, if the list of words spoken by them, given in the appendix, can be relied upon.

Just a year after leaving the coast, Dr. Smith came in sight of Lake Rudolf, and thus "attained in a measure the greatest ambition" of his life. His explorations were not over, however, for, taking with him a few men, he followed the course of a river flowing into the northern end of the lake nearly a hundred miles. From a height at his furthest point he could see the mountains bordering on Abyssinia, and, stretching towards the Nile as far as the eye could reach, a grassy plain broken only by two ranges of low hills. A considerable part of this country was uninhabited, but here were numerous villages of the Mela, "the most sociable and hospitable black people we had yet seen," and interesting as being one of the few remaining African tribes apparently free from all influence, direct or indirect, of civilization. They cultivate the ground, raising coffee, tobacco, and grain, and have "sheep, goats, and chickens, a few donkeys, but no cattle." Their thatched houses are well built, and they cross the river on a bridge of boughs lashed together and suspended to the branches of two large trees. They wear a great variety of iron and ivory ornaments, and their hemp "baskets were models of skilled workmanship."

The return journey to the coast was marked by few incidents, the most noteworthy being the suffering from terrible heat and thirst during the three days passed in the volcanic region on the southeastern shore of Lake Rudolf. In October Dr. Smith reached the port of Lamu, bringing with him all but six of his Somali. This is a remarkably good record, considering the length and difficulties of the journey, and testifies to the care which he took of his men. A large part of his narrative is occupied with his hunting exploits, many of which were of an exciting character. They become monotonous, however, and most readers not sportsmen will tire of the frequent references to the efficiency of his "577." It should be said, nevertheless, that there is little or no evidence of the indiscriminate slaughter of harmless

animals, in which some travellers have indulged. His main object was to secure rare specimens, and supply the caravan with food. There seems to have been game wherever he went. The farther he penetrated into the unexplored country, the more abundant it became. On the shore of Lake Abaya, "the zebras and hartebeests were so numerous that they appeared to form one vast herd several miles long." At another time besides these animals there were to be seen on all sides "gazelles and ostriches, as well as many giraffes and rhinoceroses." The latter, in fact, were a positive source of danger from their frequent and unprovoked attacks on the caravan. Elephants were also met with in considerable numbers, and Dr. Smith records with pardonable pride the killing of one whose tusks weighed one hundred and eight and one hundred pounds respectively. He says very little of his scientific work, but the appendices, describing a part only of his collections, show its great extent and value.

His style is generally clear, but occasionally his inexperience as a writer is evident, and here and there are some very crude statements. A good geographer and excellent map-maker, he is not an especially keen observer of the natives and their habits, and, except in one or two hunting adventures with lions, he fails to picture in a graphic way the incidents of the life in camp or on the march. On the other hand, he is unnecessarily coarse in allusions to certain native customs about which travellers are generally silent. The book is very handsomely got up (though it is too heavy for comfortable reading), and contains numerous illustrations and an interesting series of route-maps. These are so admirable that we regret to call attention to discrepancies between the spelling of names in the text and on the maps. Turfa (p. 36) and Terfa are not of much importance, but this is not true of Gorgora (p. 48) and Crórgora. We have already noticed in the heading to this article an unfortunate omission on the title-page. These are but small blemishes, however, in a work which is a distinct and valuable contribution to the literature of African exploration.

RECENT ASSYRIOLOGICAL BOOKS.

Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems, oder der Ursprung der Keilschriftzeichen, dargelegt von Friedrich Delitzsch. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1897. Pp. 240.

Assyrisches Handwörterbuch von Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch. Dritter und vierter (Schluss) Teil. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1895, 1896.

A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language (Assyrian-English-German). By W. Muss-Arnolt. Parts iv. and v., pp. 257, 320. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard; New York: Lemcke & Buechner. 1896.

The Tell el-Amarna Letters. By Hugo Winckler. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard; New York: Lemcke & Buechner. 1896.

Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts. Copied from the Original Texts by James A. Craig, Professor of Semitic Languages, etc., University of Michigan. Vol. I. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1895. Pp. viii, 83. [Assyriologische Bibliothek. Delitzsch und Haupt, xiii.]

With his usual enthusiasm, and with the manifest endeavor to observe strict scientific method, the teacher of most of the German Assyriologists, himself still young, ad-

dresses himself in his latest book, "Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems," to the fascinating problem of the origin of the cuneiform signs. It is fascinating as all exploration of obscure beginnings is fascinating, but especially so because it is, perhaps, as Delitzsch unhesitatingly calls it, the tracing of the origin of the oldest system of writing in the world, and because of the possible relation of that to later systems. It is interesting to the ethnologist as well as the epigraphist, because the oldest elements of the wedge-system represent pictorially objects and qualities which permit conclusions as to the habits of their inventors. Finally, to Assyriologists a special personal interest attaches to the book because in it Delitzsch definitely abandons all coquetry with the "Anti-Sumerians," and takes his stand again squarely on the position occupied by most sound scholars, that the signs were invented by a non-Semitic people and for a non-Semitic language. He gives unrestrained credit to the Babylonian discoveries of the expedition sent from the University of Pennsylvania for the abundance of archaic material which has made possible a fruitful study into the origin of the signs, and he dedicates his work to the members of that expedition, Mr. J. H. Haynes, Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, and Dr. John P. Peters. This is not more than just. These discoveries afford the opportunity for tracing the development of the sign-forms during a period of three or four thousand years at least, and in some instances bring us very near to the time of the inventors themselves.

After a review and criticism of previous attempts, Delitzsch with little delay enters upon the process himself by the method of analysis. Beginning with signs long recognized as showing evidence of composition even in their latest Assyrian forms, and adding others whose composite structure becomes clear when older forms are examined, he is able to resolve into earlier elements, with much probability, forms hitherto supposed simple, to discern in many cases the significance of the elements, and the reason for the particular combinations, and to recognize certain definite laws or usages according to which signs are composed. The repetition of the same sign, once, twice, or thrice, to make a compound, the addition of unlike signs, the insertion of sign within sign, the employment of various stereotyped symbols or "motives" in manifold combination, are all abundantly illustrated in detail; and while much is still doubtful and obscure, and some of Delitzsch's particular opinions will need to be modified as discovery and study go on, the fruitfulness of his method seems well made out. He has taken a long stride in advance.

It would not be profitable to attempt here to follow him step by step. Attention may be called to the "Gunierung," or, as we may say, *gunation*, *gunû* being a group of three or four parallel wedges added to an existing sign, to give additional weight to the meaning, or, in other words, to intensify it in various ways. Delitzsch finds in this one (and far the most important) among several numeral-signs, used as elements to aid in expressing compound ideas. The "motives" of *opening*, *surrounding*, *cutting*, and of *light* and *wave-motion* will serve as specimens of another class of elements. It is particularly instructive to note how many of the simplest (and probably original) elements re-

present not objects, but characteristics. We find, no doubt, pictorial representations of star and sun, of eye and hand, of ox-head and fish, of arrow and bow, but also signs which, at the earliest attainable point, denote qualities, such as evenness, fulness, motion, depression, bending, length, extension, protection. If these can be maintained—and it seems likely that most of them can be—the confirmation of an important philological theory which they afford is very striking and convincing. The surprising agreement of some of Delitzsch's results with the arrangement of the signs in the native syllabaries, showing that the compilers of these syllabaries understood the origin and the proper affiliation of the signs, can be only alluded to. Delitzsch enumerates thirty-seven original signs at present recognizable, and expresses the belief that the entire number will not prove to exceed forty-five or fifty. From these the four hundred and more which meet us in the syllabaries and texts have been formed. By tabulating these primitive signs he is able to reach interesting conclusions as to the condition and habits of the people that invented the signs, according to which they enjoyed a relatively high degree of culture. The seven pages devoted to the exposition of these results will be to many the chief attraction of the book.

The least satisfactory part of the volume is the closing chapter, "Ausblick auf das phönikische Alphabet," in which Delitzsch suggests that the originators of the alphabet may have borrowed the acrophonic principle from Egypt, while influenced in the choice of objects to be represented, perhaps to some extent in the names of the characters, and even possibly in the selection of forms, by the Babylonian sign-system. It is unsatisfactory, not because of its view of the Phœnician alphabet as eclectic in origin—this seems by no means improbable—but partly because of its necessarily sketchy character, and partly because it leaves wholly out of account other possibilities, such, e. g., as those cautiously suggested by Mr. Arthur Evans in his 'Cretan Pictographs and Præ-Phœnician Script' (reviewed in these columns a year ago). But this chapter is of the nature of an excursus, and its suggestions are doubtless worthy of being considered. The book is attractively made, in autograph, with good margins, and has an index of the cuneiform signs discussed.

The completion of Delitzsch's smaller Assyrian Dictionary has for the first time put into the hands of students a convenient and trustworthy lexical hand-book to the cuneiform literature. To finality it of course cannot lay claim, nor does Delitzsch himself suppose that it can. He expressly disavows this. The vocabulary is constantly increasing, and doubtful meanings are modified or wholly changed by the advance of study. But it will not lose its value for many years. It is at present simply indispensable. Its characteristics have been sufficiently considered by us on a former occasion. We add merely that the decided and positive attitude now taken by the author in the "Sumerian" question (see above) makes us regret afresh that etymological discussions have been excluded from his plan. But, even as it is, he has rendered a signal service to Assyriology and to Semitic science in general by this work, which has involved labor such as only dictionary-makers can understand. In his brief preface (appended to part iv.) he ex-

presses the hope of enlarging and improving it from time to time. The project of completing his larger Assyrian Dictionary, also, seems not to be abandoned. One remark in this preface we notice with some regret:

"Der letzteren [d. h. der assyriologischen Fachliteratur] konnte ich leider während der Vorbereitung und Ausarbeitung meines Handwörterbuches eingehendere Beachtung nicht schenken, da ich vom ersten Anfang an entschlossen war, dieses lexikalische Gebäude ganz nach eigenem Plan und eigener Methode im Grossen wie im Kleinen aufzuführen, selbst auf die Gefahr hin fehlzugehen, wo Andere vielleicht Richtigeres erkannt hätten."

That is to say, Delitzsch has not attended to the opinions of others, because he was determined to be independent even at the risk of mistakes. This ought, perhaps, to make us admire his work more, as the product of the unaided scholarship of one man, but it reminds us, rather, of his boast that the little dictionary appended to the third edition of his 'Assyrische Lesestücke' (1885) was written from memory. *Tours de force* of this kind are hardly in place in lexicography. It is a gratification to read further:

"Mit um so grösserem Eifer lasse ich es mir jetzt angelegen sein, die Arbeiten der Fachgenossen zu studieren und zu prüfen, um mit ihrer Hilfe, wo dies nöthig erscheint, die eigenen Aufstellungen zu modificieren und zu korrigieren, und dann eines Jeden Priorität freudig anzuerkennen, wo immer in wichtigen Punkten das meines Erachtens Richtige bereits anderwärts ausgesprochen sich findet."

This may not be quite logical, but it is undoubtedly correct.

Muss-Arnolt's work, unlike Delitzsch's, abounds in references to Assyriological literature, and this is one of its valuable features. We should be glad of a more critical attitude toward the authorities he cites, and this is especially important from the student's standpoint; but, apart from this, its ample collection of references is of great service. This, and its etymological comparisons and remarks, give it an importance independent of Delitzsch's dictionary, although it cannot be regarded as a work of the same grade. The omission of the statement "To be completed in about [7—] 8 parts" from the cover of Part v. is ominous, but evidently truthful. Part v. does not finish the letter *Chett*; i. e., on p. 320 it has reached the point which Delitzsch reached on p. 281. At this rate, Delitzsch's 716 pp. (exclusive of additions, corrections, etc.) will become more than 800 pp. in Muss-Arnolt's hands, and the work will run to twelve or thirteen parts. In view of this, and of the large resulting cost of the completed work, it is questionable whether the space employed by the use of both English and German definitions has been wisely used. But when all criticisms, including the more strictly philological ones, to which the book is doubtless open, have been made, it remains a painstaking and useful work, and there is no proper justification for the contemptuous treatment it has received in some quarters.

It is a great satisfaction to have the Tell el-Amarna letters published in accurate transcription and translation (as far as scholarship at present allows) in the compass of one handy volume. The significance of these documents is well known, and need not be here enlarged upon. Dr. Winckler has long been entitled to speak about them with as much authority as any man. The letters are arranged topically, without re-

gard to their order in the publications of the texts hitherto made, though always, with indication of their place in those publications. Thus we have I., Letters from Kings of Western Asia, and II., Letters from Phœnician and Canaanite Princes, with those between Egypt and Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt, Mitani and Egypt, and letters from Cyprus, grouped separately under the former head, in a manner convenient for reference and comparison. There are 296 letters in all, including (as No. 219) the solitary find at Tel-Hesi. After the usual 'Remarks and Corrections' there is a vocabulary and a list of the proper names.

As remarked above, this is not the place to repeat what is already known about the importance of these letters. But the book would have been more complete if a brief account of their discovery and value had been prefixed to it, and a more definite statement of their present whereabouts. Even without this, however, it will stand for a long time as the authoritative publication, for common use, of these remarkable epistles, which have for the last ten years been shedding such unaccustomed light on the relation of peoples and languages in Western Asia thirty-four hundred years ago.

The task which Prof. Craig has set himself is greatly needed. Much has been written about Assyrian and Babylonian Religion. Prof. Sayce gave a course of the Hibbert lectures on the subject a few years ago. Other discussions of the matter, comprehensive or special, are scattered about. The popular books speak confidently, and draw sweeping conclusions. But, in fact, the preliminary work needed before a sound treatment of the theme can be given is as yet very fragmentary. The texts which furnish the materials for our knowledge of the religion of these peoples need to be carefully and fully edited before a true presentation of that religion can be made. Prof. Craig undertakes to supply a part of the deficiency in this field. The materials are not in the form of treatises on theology. We have to reconstruct the beliefs of ancient peoples in large part out of such exercises of worship as have come down to us. We learn their religious conceptions by observing how they prayed and sang their praises. Hymns and prayers, liturgical formulas, and oracular responses, chants of conjuration and ritual provisions are the sources of much, perhaps most, of our trustworthy knowledge. Prof. Craig has therefore done well to edit these texts. They are neatly autographed, on one side of heavy paper with wide margin. Those in volume i. number about forty, in some cases put together laboriously from different fragments. They are mostly from the Kuyunjik collection and in the later Assyrian character; some belong to the time of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Asurbanipal; but some are undoubtedly copies of older originals. The translation and comments are reserved for the second volume, but in the preface to volume i. Prof. Craig makes some statements about the nature of the religious belief of the Assyrians, and its relation to that of the Hebrews, which are worthy of all attention. It is true that the inference he seems to draw from the religious conceptions of the King to those of the common people is perhaps rather unguarded. It would be indeed a surprise to learn that the high spiritual thoughts of some of the royal prayers were widely shared by the populace. But the same thing would have

to be said concerning the Hebrews in the time of Hezekiah.

Reminiscences and Letters of Caroline C. Briggs. Edited by George S. Merriam. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1897.

This book is of the family of those which admit us to the companionship of remarkable people who have no notoriety or reputation, and who encourage us with the assurance that there are many such. It will give great pleasure to the friends of Mrs. Briggs, however they may regret a touch of excessive intimacy here and there, and hardly less to many who impinge, at one point or another, on the wide circle of her friendships, experiences, and sympathies, and to those especially who look back regretfully to the simplicity of their early life, the homely work and cheer of circumstances which can never be restored. The student of social manners and development will find here a memoir so serviceable as to suggest comparisons with Mrs. Susan Leslie's 'Recollections of My Mother,' one of the most graphic pictures ever painted of the best social and domestic life that was developed in the interior towns of New England from seventy-five to fifty years ago. It is a fact of questionable import that the local situation here is the same as there. Both Mrs. Leslie and Mrs. Briggs were born and brought up in Northampton, Mass. But, however glad we might have been to be guided to fresh woods and pastures new, these are extremely pleasant; to see Judge Lyman's household from another point of view is a great satisfaction, and also to see Mrs. Leslie as others saw her with admiring eyes.

Mr. Merriam's work as an editor has been mainly one of selection; he has written only a few pages here and there. But it was he who instigated his friend to write the "Reminiscences," which cover 155 pages and are the most interesting part of the book. They are written in "that style which makes all our literary writing seem cheap," as Mr. Howells said of the memoirs of General Grant. It is strange that a literary instinct so marked never tempted or compelled its possessor into a literary career. The father was at once farmer and jailer, and we have the frankest possible description of his sturdy character and the manner of his life, of his wife also and of a beloved sister of Mrs. Briggs, while the servants, self-respecting New England women, and the neighbors and friends, and the whole order of domestic, social, and religious life are vividly portrayed. One of the most interesting chapters describes the religious life of a family consciously heretical, and a succession of Unitarian ministers, Hall, Ellis, Dwight, and Stearns, no one of whom has ever before been subjected to an appreciation at once so honest and so kind. But the family doctor, one of the many medical flints, is described more lovingly than any of these, even John S. Dwight. "His eyes were blue as violets, and would fill with tears while a big oath was on his lips." As for the writer, she paints herself with a more absolute frankness than any of her sitters. Eager, passionate, wilful, affectionate, one is reminded strongly by her of Mary Ann Evans in her stormy early youth.

Her life went on for eleven years after her "Reminiscences" were written, and her letters give a profound and beautiful im-

pression of her outward and her inward life. Great losses and sorrows came to her, but she bore them with the stoutest heart. Her piety was without any supernaturalist supports, but it was sufficient for her every need. There was something strongly individual in her perfect confidence in a future life. But in her life and thought there was not a hint of other-worldliness. No one ever rejoiced in the beauty of this world more heartily. Indeed, the dominant note is a passionate delight in nature; a keenly sensuous note, yet not unspiritual, because the beauty of the world was the sure ground of her confidence in "the eternal goodness," a revelation of that goodness to her heart. Taken as a whole, the book is one of the healthiest imaginable, and it must have a tonic influence on those who read it. Some of them will be made deservedly happy by such remarks as those upon Samuel May of Leicester; others may not enjoy their portion. We could wish that the editor had been more explicit in defining the persons engaged in the correspondence, and more exclusive of such matters as "rubbing," which, however joyous for the rubbed one, add nothing to the reader's happiness. But the defects are few, and in the main a task extremely delicate has been discharged in a manner equal to the sacredness of a friendship, of no common breadth or height.

The Liquor Problem in its Legislative Aspects.

By Frederick H. Wines and John Koren. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1897.

THIS book contains the results of investigations made for the "Sociological Group," a number of gentlemen interested in the study of our social conditions, who decided that the "drink problem" might properly receive immediate attention. The method employed has been historical rather than scientific; that is to say, the investigators have had no definite end set before them as a solution, no hypothesis to be tested. Of course, under such conditions, there is nothing to be done but to set down what is to be seen and heard, after the manner of the newspaper reporter or special correspondent. This work the investigators in the present case have done very well. They report on the conditions existing under eight different kinds of liquor legislation. They furnish no complete statistics, for there are none to be had, either of the amount of liquor consumed or of the number of arrests because of drunkenness. But they certainly make good their modest claim to furnish some evidence as to the success in promoting temperance of the various kinds of legislation described, as well as to exhibit their social and political effects.

The difficulties in the way of such researches are not trifling. The prejudices of witnesses are violent; the interests of those most competent to testify are against publicity. So far as opinion is concerned, it is possible to obtain every variety, and yet it is necessary to depend upon opinion when seeking to determine a moral question. There are some hard facts, such as that drunken people are frequently seen in Maine; that the United States Government issues about a thousand licenses to sell liquor there; that there are annually more than a thousand prosecutions for violations of the liquor laws, etc. But as to the general results of prohibition, it is easy for those who believe in it to say they are good, and for those who dis-

believe in it to say they are bad. What the judgment of these investigators is, appears from this reference to some of its evils:

"The public have seen law defied, a whole generation of habitual lawbreakers schooled in evasion and shamelessness, courts ineffective through fluctuations of policy, delays, perjuries, negligences, and other miscarriages of justice, officers of the law double-faced and mercenary, legislators timid and insincere, candidates for office hypocritical and truckling, and office-holders unfaithful to pledges and to reasonable public expectation."

That these results have attended prohibitory legislation, that they have in general attended legislation in so far as it is prohibitory, are conclusions amply supported by evidence.

Much that is interesting and instructive concerning the working of the various systems of liquor legislation is to be found in these pages, and it is well that it should be laid before the public. But it would be better if the true nature of the problem were scientifically stated.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

- Ade, George. *Pink Marsh: A Story of the Streets and Town.* Chicago: H. S. Stone & Co.
A Fascinating Sinner. F. T. Neely.
Britton, Prof. N. L., and Brown, Addison. *An Illustrated Flora of the Northern United States, Canada, and the British Possessions.* Vol. II. *Portulacaceæ to Meryanthaceæ.* Scribners. \$2.
Bury, Prof. J. B. *Gibbon's Roman Empire.* Vol. II. London: Methuen & Co.; New York: Macmillan. \$2.
Calamus: A Series of Letters by Walt Whitman to a Young Friend. Boston: Laurens Maynard. \$1.
Carlyle, Thomas. *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.* Vols. II. and III. [Centenary Edition.] Scribners. \$2.50.
Carpenter, Prof. F. L. *English Lyric Poetry, 1500-1700.* London: Blackie & Son; New York: Scribners. \$1.50.
Douglas, Sir George. *The "Blackwood" Group.* [Famous Scots.] Scribners. 75c.
Elshemus, L. M. "Lady" Vere, and Other Narratives. New York: Eastman Lewis. \$1.25.
Elshemus, L. M. *Mammon, a Spirit-Song.* New York: Eastman Lewis. \$1.25.
FitzGerald, Edward. *Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám.* St. Paul: B. W. Porter. \$1.
Florio's Montaigne. Vol. III. [Temple Classics.] London: Dent; New York: Macmillan. 50c.
Gladstone, W. E. *Later Gleanings: Theological and Ecclesiastical.* Scribners. \$1.25.
Hardy, W. J. *Book-Plates.* 2d ed. London: Kegan Paul; New York: Scribners. \$1.50.
Howard, Clifford. *Sex Worship.* Washington: The Author. \$1.25.
Kupfer, Grace H. *Stories of Long Ago in a New Dress.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 35c.
Larned, W. C. *Arnaut's Masterpiece: A Romance of the Pyrenees.* Scribners. \$1.25.
Lee, Albert. *The Knave of Hearts.* R. H. Russell. 50c.
Marryat, Capt. Snarleygown. Macmillan. \$1.50.
Matzke, Prof. J. E. *First Spanish Readings.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. \$1.
Maxwell, Sir Herbert. *Memories of the Months: Being Pages from the Notebook of a Field Naturalist.* Edward Arnold.
Omond, G. W. T. *Fletcher of Saltoun.* [Famous Scots.] Scribners. 75c.
Page, T. N. *The Old Gentleman of the Black Stock.* Scribners. 75c.
Pearson, Prof. Karl. *The Chances of Death, and Other Studies in Evolution.* 2 vols. Edward Arnold. \$8.
Rathbone, St. George. *A Bar Sinister.* F. T. Neely. 50c.
Reed, V. Z. *Tales of the Sun-Land.* Continental Publishing Co. \$1.25.
Rider, S. S. *Soul-Liberty—Rhode Island's Gift to the Nation.* Providence: S. S. Rider. \$1.25.
Rider, S. S. *The Forgeries connected with the Deed given by the Sachems Canonius and Miantinomi to Roger Williams.* Providence: The Author. \$2.00.
Rossetti, Christina. *Maunder: Prose and Verse.* Chicago: H. S. Stone & Co.
Russell, B. A. W. *An Essay on the Foundations of Geometry.* Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan. \$2.
Sargeant, Adelaide. *Margory Moore's Lovers.* F. T. Neely. 50c.
Seth, Prof. Andrew. *Man's Place in the Cosmos, and Other Essays.* Scribners. \$2.
Stiness, J. H. *A Century of Lotteries in Rhode Island, 1744-1844.* Providence: S. S. Rider. \$2.25.
The Romance of Isabel Lady Burton. 2 vols. Dodd, Mead & Co. \$7.50.
Thompson, Francis. *New Poems.* Boston: Cope-land & Day.
Thomson, J. S. *Estabelle, and Other Verse.* Toronto: William Briggs.
Thomson, H. C. *The Outgoing Turk: Impressions of a Journey through the Western Balkans.* Appletons. \$4.
Tooley, Sarah A. *The Personal Life of Queen Victoria.* Dodd, Mead & Co. \$2.
Totten, C. A. L. *Our Inheritance in the Great Seal.* New Haven: Our Race Publishing Co.
Wells, Prof. B. W. *Drei Kleine Lustspiele.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 30c.
Wells, Prof. B. W. *Labiche and Martin's La Poudre aux Yeux.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 25c.
Wilcox, Ella W. *Sweet Danger.* F. T. Neely.